A SYNOPSIS OF QUAKERISM:

OR,

A Collection of the Fundamental ERROURS of the QUAKERS:

Whereof these are a Taste, *Viz.*

1. That there are not Three Persons in the God-Head.
2. That Christ did not make Satisfaction for the Sin of *Man*.
3. That Justification is not by imputed Righteousness.
4. That our good Works, are the *Meritorious* Cause of our Justification.
5. That a State of Freedom from Sin, is attainable in this Life.
6. That there is a Light in every *Man*, sufficient to guide him to Salvation.
7. That the Scripture is not the Word of God, nor a standing Rule of Faith and Life.
8. That there is no Resurrection of the Body.
9. That there's no need nor use of Ordinances, Baptisme, Lords Supper, *&c.*

Collected out of their Printed Books.

With a Brief Refutation of their most material Arguments, (and particularly, *W. Penn*, in his late *Sandy Foundation Shaken*) and an Essay towards the Establishment of private Christians, in the Truths opposed by those *Errours*.

By *Tho. Danson*, sometime Minister of the Gospel at *Sandwich* in *Kent*.

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1668.

To the Reader.

Reader,

THe *late daring Pamphlet of* W. Pen, *Intituled,* The Sandy Foundation Shaken, *wherein he hath attempted (but with too Feeble an hand) to shake the Rock, Christ Jesus in his God-Head, and Offices, hath occasioned this Undertakement. Seeing God had left him to himself so farr, as openly to vilifie Three Grand Truths, I judge it not amiss, to take this opportunity to mind the World, how well he hath Imitated the Leaders of his Party, in their respects to other like Truths, that so the Christians of these Parts, may no longer be Imposed upon by the* Quakers *seeming Innocence. The most refend civil Heathens were given over to the most Fond and Beastly* Errours, *about the Nature of God. It was observed of many of our* English Hereticks *in* Queen Elizabeth's *dayes, that they were Charitably Devout: And you know many that look well in the Face, have their Inwards Tainted and Decayed. I presume* Reader, *thou hast Read over the Frontispiece of this Book, and then tell me what you think; Do those Principles sound like* Christian Doctrine? *Do you not think your Heart would give your Tongue the Lye, if (for fear of seeming rigid) you should venture to say, of the Teachers of those Doctrines; These are*

the Servants of the most High God, who shew unto us the way of Salvation, Acts 16. 17. *Why then take heed how thou harkenest unto them, unless thou art unconcerned in thy self, and art indifferent whither Salvation or Damnation fall to thy share. I am prevented in a serious Representation, of the danger of these* Errours *by the Pains of my Worthy Friend,* Mr. Tho. Vincent. *The mention of whose name, puts me in mind of a Query, thou mayst make about my Answer to* Pens *Arguments, why I do* actum agere? *The Answer is, I was Ingaged in a little Conference with the said* Pen, *and he hath made some Reflections upon me, in the same Piece, which are not to be wholly neglected: Again, Experience hath shewn, that there is a great difference in Intellectual Gusts.*

The Method, Phrase, *Notions of scarce any one man, are acceptable to all.*

And a President is at hand. Biddles 12. Arguments *against the* Holy Ghost's Deity, *were first answered by the Learned* Estwick, *and then by the Learned* Pool, *and both to good purpose, & I hope not without success.*

And if any Quaker *shall demand, why I do not answer* Sam. Fisher's *Book, against me, instead of Writing against a new Man; I answer, that I am guided in my Neglect by the Judgment of abler Persons than my self, that that Book is but a bundle of Impertinent Cavils, and none of my Arguments is shaken by his Batteries; and that to answer it, were but* Horas bonas male collocare, *to spend time with* Domitian, *in catching of Flies. I shall only leave two words of Advice with thee, and so we will part.* 1. *Be*

1. *Be at some pains, to understand the positive Grounds, of the great Truths, opposed by the Quakers. Remember that Wisdom is Silver, and a Treasure; not only for its Excellency, but also for the difficulty of* Attainment, Prov. 2. 4. *It was the Observation of* Min. Fel. Multi ob tædium investigandæ veritatis, divertunt in proximos Errores, *i. e. Many men, through Impatience of the Pains they must be at, to find out the Truth, turn into the Errours next at hand. As a weary Traveller takes up his Lodging, not at the best but at the nearest Inn. Be not thou a new Instance, to confirm that unhappy Observation. For want of some pains, many Christians are strangely Ignorant, and through Ignorance, uncertain like Glasses, which may be blown into any shape you please; or Weather-Cocks, that are indifferent to any Point of the Heavens. To lessen thy pains somewhat, I have endeavoured to give thee the most material Arguments, by which those Truths are supported, in as plain and familiar a way as I could, and as the Nature of the subjects would bear. Particularly, be at some pains, to understand the right use of Reason, about these sacred Mysteries. Namely, that it is not to judge of the Truth of the Propositions, contained in the Scriptures, but of their Connexion: Take an Instance,* 1 Cor. 15. 13. *If there be no Resurrection from the Dead, then is Christ not risen. The Propositions, that the dead shall be raised, and that Christ is raised from the dead, are de fide, or matters of Faith: but the Connexion, or Consequence of the Apostle, is evident to reason, as*

depending upon that Maxime of Reason, Sublato effectu tollitur causa; *Deny the effect, and deny the cause, if it be necessary, and not an accidential Cause, and like this, if it be not day, tis not Sun-rise.*

And therefore the Socinians, *who pretend, that we are not to believe any thing to be of Divine Revelation, which is not evident to our reason, do discover but little of that reason, which they would be thought to have Ingrossed to themselves: For, does not Reason tell us, that the Nature and Works of God are above our reach? And that God were not God, if he could be comprehended by a Creature; nor are the Creatures* ad æquate *effects of God their cause.*

And indeed their Principle takes away the difference between Divine Knowledge and Faith. Where is there any room for an assent to Truth, Propter authoritatem revelantis, *upon the credit of Gods word, if we are to believe nothing, but what antecedently to Divine Revelation, is evident to reason in its next causes, or proper Effects. Nor can I see what use Miracles can be of to a* Socinian; *the Intendment of which, is to inforce a belief of those Doctrines, which are inevident to Reason: It being a Principle, which no man will contradict, that God will not put the Seal of his Immediate Power to a Falsehood.*

2. *Improve the Knowledge which you have: I have often thought it a wise & sober speech of* Card. Pool, *that when one asked him how he should do to understand the former part of* Pauls Epistle to the Romans, *Replied, by practising the latter,* [the former

mer part being Doctrinical and hard, the latter Practical and plain] In vita Card. Poli. *The neglect of such Advice, hath provoked God to give men over to strong Delusions, to believe* Lies, *gross Figments, such as I have here presented thee with.* Reader, *I shall not detain thee any longer, but recommend thee and this small* Piece *to the Blessing of God; by which, if thou art preserved from being led away with the* Errours *of the Wicked, and falling from thy own stedfastness, I have obtained my end, and shall therein rejoyce for ever,*

London. *Decemb.* 13. 1668.

Thy Servant in the Gospel,

Tho. Danson.

A Synopsis of Quakerisme.

1. Errour.

That One God does not subsist in Three Persons.

THree things I must necessarily premise before I come to the proof of the Proposition; which the Quakers deny.

1. I must necessarily explain the word *Person*, the usual Definition is, *Rationalis naturæ individua Substantia*; or an individual Substance of a rational Nature, which *Aquinas* defends, *Sum. Par.* 1. *Q.* 29. *art.* 2. but some think it lyable to some Exception, as whereby the humane Soul separated from the Body, and the humane Nature of Christ, are made Persons, and therefore add to it, *Quæ nec est pars alterius, nec ab alio Sustentatur*, i. e. which is neither the part of an other, nor is upheld by an other. I shall not interpose my Judgment in the case, as remembering, that I write for the

Unlearned

Unlearned. I shall chuse to borrow that of the Learned *Wottan*, on *John* 1. *vers.* 1. 2. *pag.* 29. which is the plainest, and will not be gain-said I suppose by any Learned Man. *A Person is an individual Subsistence* [or *Subsistent* rather] *in an intellectual Nature*; or *a several or singular thing, that subsists by it self, in a nature indued with Understanding.*

1. The thing which we call a Person, is by nature indued with Reason and Understanding. A man we call a Person, but we give not that name unto a *brute Beast* [An individual or singular Creature of that kind, is called in the Schools *Suppositum.*]

2. A Person notes some *one* indued with Reason and Understanding, which is several and distinct by himself from another. And hereby we exclude, 1. Qualities or Vertues, as Fortitude, Temperance, *&c.* from being Persons, though found in a rational Nature, and distinct one from another, because they subsist not by themselves, but in a subject. For a Person is entire of it self, and must not depend on any thing as a property thereof. And hereby we exclude, 2. The Soul separated from the Body; for the Soul is a part of the humane Species, or of mans Nature, and *Retinet naturam unibilitatis* (as *Aquinas* speaks, *Sum. p.* 1. *Q.* 29. *art.* 2.) is to be looked upon as a part still in its Separation (the Separation of it from the Body being a violence offer'd to it) and therefore can no more be called

led a Person, then the hand or foot cut off the Body, [or then a part, the foot, for instance of a Beast can be call'd a *Suppositum*.]

2. That the word *person*, cannot properly be attributed to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, because they do not subsist in a several and distinct Nature of the same kind: for if each of them had a several, and not one individual Nature, then they should be not only Three Persons, but Three Gods, which need not be a wonder; for, as *Divines* say, *Deus & creatura nihil habent commune preter nomen.* God and the Creature have nothing common to them both, but names which Rule must be understood, with the Limitation that other Rule suggests, *Nomina de Deo, & creaturis non univoce nec pure æquivoce, Sed analogice dicuntur secundum analogiam Creaturarum ad ipsum.* Aquinas, Sum. par. 1. Q. 29. Art. 3. That the names common to God and the Creatures, do not signifie simply the same thing, nor wholly different; but something wherein the Creature bears some Analogy to God.

3. Yet may this word *person* be used by us (and tis used in the Scripture, of the Father, *Heb.* 1. 3.) to express the distinction of Father, Son, and Spirit in the God-Head, and one from another. And the reason why it may be used, is this, because *a person* signifies that which is most excellent and perfect in Nature; and what the Scripture hath revealed to us, concerning that distinction in the God-Head, cannot be apprehended

tended by us, under any other Notion, or Resemblance, which therefore we Attribute to God, yet after a most excellent manner.

For the nature of Man being finite, may be multiplyed into many several Men or Persons of the same kind or Nature. But the *divine nature* being infinite, cannot possibly admit of a Multiplication. (For that there should be two infinite Natures, implies a Contradiction) Therefore when Father, Son, and Spirit are said to be Three, and yet but one God, we know not what to call those three, but Persons; for there is that ascribed to them, (*viz.* Properties and Operations,) which cannot agree, but either to Three Gods, or Three Subsistents (that is, persons, though not strictly, yet proportionably, or Analogically so call'd) in the God-Head.

And thus *I* think *I* have in effect answered all the Arguments of the *Antitrinitarians*, before *I* meddle with them. For their πρῶτον ψεῦδος, or grand Errour is, that because the word *person* is not prædicated of Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, and of the Creature *vnivoce*; that is, the same word does not signifie wholly the same thing in God and the Creature.

Therefore they deny Personality of Son and Spirit: whereas, though the name *person* does not agree to them in the sence of it's first Imposition, yet it does, as to what we intend to signi-

fie

ſie thereby, anſwerable to the notion the Scripture hath Impreſſed on our minds, *Vid. Aquin. Sum. Q. 29. art. 3. p. 1.*

In the next place, I ſhall propoſe one Scripture, and from thence gather ſome Concluſions, the proof whereof, will be all I ſhall offer, and as much as will be needful for private Chriſtian's Confirmation in the Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

1. John 5. 7. *For there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy-Ghoſt; and theſe Three are One.*

The cauſal Conjunction *for*, implies a reaſon of ſomewhat foregoing, (*viz*) *That Jeſus Chriſt was the Son of God*, verſ. 5. And ſo theſe words contain an Argument drawn from indubitable Teſtimonies. And from them we may deduce,

Prop. 1. That there is but *one* God; *one* in this verſe is explained as meant of God, *verſ.* 9. *The Witneſs of God* is greater, referring to the Witneſs concerning Chriſt, *verſ.* 7. not to *verſ.* 8. for none of thoſe Witneſſes are God.

Prop. 2. That Father, Word, and Spirit are Three Subſiſtents [or *perſons*.]

1. He attributes the Act of bearing Record to them; now all Witneſſes [properly ſo call'd] are Perſons.

2. That is not all, but the Apoſtle joyns *Word* and *Holy-Ghoſt*, with the Father (whom all acknowledge a Perſon) as Witneſs of the ſame

kind:

kind; so that if he be a Person, then are they also Persons.

3. I add, that the attributes of God the Father, or instance Omniscience, which cannot agree but to a Person, are also ascribed to the Word (or Son) and to the Spirit. *Jesus* knew all things, *Joh.* 2.22. *Acts* 5.9. of which see the Fifth Proposition: I know that this proves their Deity too, but I produce it only to prove their Personality.

Prop. 3. That Father, Word, or Son, and Spirit, are Subsistants, or Persons of the same Order, *In Heaven*, as to the Father; notes the Seat of his Glory and Majesty (as appears by the use of that phrase in the *Lords Prayer*) and why not then, as to Word and Spirit? And some stamp of Divinity more than ordinary is intended, for otherwise there are many Witnesses and Persons in Heaven; the Angels, who from Heaven bore Record of Christ, *Luke* 2.10,13.

Prop. 4. That the Father, Word (or *Son*) and Spirit, are distinct one from another, appears from the Text, in Conjunction with the story to which they refer *Mat.* 3.17. where the Father and Spirit bear Record concerning the *Son*, as one distinct from them both. And *John* 8.18. the Word did bear Record of himself: And these did bear Record in a different manner: The Father by a Voice from Heaven; the *Spirit* by assuming the shape of a Dove; The *Son* by Word of Mouth on Earth. Put all together, here

were

were Testimonies given from distinct places, Earth, Heaven; to distinct Senses, Ear, Eye; by distinct actions, speaking, assuming a shape. Then these Witnesses must needs be distinct.

Again, it appears, the Father, Son, and Spirit, are distinct one from another.

1. From their Incommunicable Properties; The Father begets, and is not begotten; the Son is begotten, and does not beget, *Heb.* 1. *For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, ver. 5. The Apostle speaks of an Eternal Generation of the Son of God, declared and made manifest in time, by the Resurrection of Christ from the dead: see *Acts* 13.33. compared with *Rom.* 1. 4. *John* 1. 18. Christ is called *the only begotten Son of God.* The spirit proceeds from the Father, *John* 15.26. and Christ says, I will send from the Father; a mission implies a procession from both.

2. From their Order, which may be collected from those properties: The Father must needs be first in order of Original, (as in time also, a Father is among men) and the Son next, for *Relata sunt simul Natura.* The Father and Son are together in Nature: and then the spirit proceeding from both, must needs in order, be after both.

3. From their manner of Operation, one place will suffice; *But when the Comforter is come, whom*

whom I will send unto you from the Father, &c. *Joh.* 16. That Mission was but a manifestation of the presence of the Spirit, by a new effect, *viz.* or a clearer Revelation of Christ, and the order is, the *Son* sends from the Father, or the Father sends by the *Son*, the Spirit, to testifie of Christ.

Prop. 5. *To* be proved is, that every one of these *Three* distinct Persons, are truly God. *vers.* 9. He calls the Witnesse, given by Three in in Heaven, the Witnesse of God; therefore each Witnesse is God, not to speak of the names God given to them, which is more lyable to cavil (as being sometimes given to Creatures.

1. *It* appears by the properties of the God-Head, given to *Son* and *Spirit* (as for the Father, he is acknowledged to be God, on all hands.)

1. From their Omnipresence, Lo, *I am with you always to the end of the World*, Math. 28. *ult.* spoken of Christ, *Psal.* 139. 7. *Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?*

2. Omniscience, John. 2. 24. *Jesus knew all men*, Acts. 5. 9. *Why have yee agreed together to Tempt the spirit of the Lord*, i.e. to try whither he could discover your Hypocrisie. There are other Instances of Divine properties, but let these suffice.

2. By the Works or Operations proper to God, as 1. Creation, *Eccles.* 12. 1. *Remember thy Creator*, to the Heb. [illegible] Heb. 1. 2. By whom

whom also he made the World; 'Tis spoken of God the Father, with reference to Christ, and it implies, that the Son of God joyned with his Father in making the World, as an efficient Cause equal in Power: not as an Instrument, for there can be none in Creation; because, to make something out of nothing, requires Infinite power; and between a finite power and nothing, there is no proportion, *Job* 33. 4. *The spirit of God hath made me.* 2. Preservation, *Heb.* 1. 3. *Upholding all things by the Word of his Power*, spoken of the Son (or Christ) *Gen.* 1. 2. *And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the Waters*, [illegible] *Commovens in cubans*, used of Birds brooding their Young, *Deut.* 32. 11. and so applied metaphorically to the spirits Operation in conferring the *Chaos*.

3. That Son and Spirit are truly God, *Ha.* 1. 2. 8. by the Right they have to be Objects of Divine Worship: *And let all the Angels of God worship him*, Spoken of the Son, who is called God, and said to have a Throne or Seat of Majesty, to the person whereon Worship is given, *Heb.* 1. 6, 8. and *Rev.* 1. Grace, Mercy, and Peace from him, which is, and is to come, and from the seven spirits, (*i. e.* the spirit that is manifested in Variety of Gifts) which are before the Throne, and from Jesus Christ.

Though *John* speaks in the Third Person, yet it is a *Prayer*, and so in effect, an address to the Persons; as if he had said, O Father, Son, and

spirit, Grant these Churches Grace, Mercy, and Peace. *Cant. 4. ult. Awake thou North Wind, and come thou South*, i.e. O Blessed Spirit, breath into my heart; spirit compared to Wind, *John 3. 8.* the same Word signifies both to 1. And to the son, *Acts 7. 59. Lord Jesus receive my spirit.*

Prop. 6. That these Persons are not divided one from another, so as to be Three Gods; but one God, appears from the Text, in that he call the Witness of Three, the Witness of one; *viz.* in nature or essence, which is *vers. 9.* said to be God; not Three Divine natures, but one is predicated of the Three Witnesses.

And thus a way is made to an Answer to W. Ps. Arguments.

Arg. 1. If there be Three distinct Persons, then Three distinct Substances.

Ans. I deny the Consequence; because, as we shewed before, the Word Person is not predicated of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the Creature *univoce*; that is, the same Word does not signifie wholly the same thing in God and the Creature; But in God, Three Persons notes a subsisting of Three in one Individual Nature; in Men, a subsisting of (Three) *Peter, James, and John*; suppose for instance, in Three divided, or several Natures of the same kind.

Arg. 2. Either the Divine Persons are Finite or Infinite.

Infinite; if Infinite, then three distinct Infinites, and so three Gods.

Ans. 1. We may deny the Disjunction, finiteness and infiniteness are not Personal, but Essential properties: For in the Notion of the Nature, those properties are contained, before you consider that Nature as in a Person. So finiteness in respect of man, and infiniteness in respect of God. And hence, though all the properties of the Divine Nature, whereof, infiniteness is one, agree to each Person subsisting in that Nature, yet will it not follow, that there are *three* Infinites, but only one; because there are not *three* Divine Natures, but only one; of which one Nature, Infiniteness is a property.

Ans. 2. Suppose we grant that these *three* Persons may be said to be Infinite, 'tis no more in effect, than to say, that these *three Persons* are God; we may as well attribute to the Person, the property included in the Divine Nature, as the Divine Nature, which includes the property (the Nature and Property being one, re, though not *ratione*.)

Ans. 3. Yet will it not follow, that Father, Son, and Spirit, be *three* distinct Infinites; or which is all one, *three* distinct Gods (the property and Nature being really one, though different, according to our way of apprehension, as I said above) because those *three* subsist not in *three* severall; but in one Individual Nature.

Arg. 3. *If each Person be God, and that God subsists in Three Persons; then in each Person are Three Persons, or Gods, and so from Three, they will increase to nine.*

Ans. 1. If he understands the Termes, God, as we do (in the Antecedent) of God essentially, no such consequence will follow, no more than in this instance.

If *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, each Person be Man, and that Man subsists in those *three* Persons, then in each of those *three* Persons, are *three* Persons, or Men, and so from *three*, they will increase to nine. Take *Man* here, not as a Person, but the Nature as we do *God*, in the Antecedent of *Pens* Hypothetical Syllogism, and its evident that we mean no more, then that the name *Man* may be attributed to *Peter*, *James* and *John*, because the same humane Nature (we mean specifically) agrees to them, and so is the name *God* attributed to each Person, because the same Divine Nature subsists in each of them, (or rather, each of them subsists in the same numerically) Divine Nature.) (There is no Consequence in *Pens* Argument, unless we held, that each person in the Godhead, subsists in three persons (which he goes about unworthily, to insinuate)

Ans. 2. I rather think he hath catched at some what in our Writers, which he did not well understand, which he would represent as our Judgments, (and thence deduce his absurd Consequence

quence) (*viz.*) that Nature and Person in the God-Head, or God, are one thing. For the Nature of God is so simple, that it admits of no parts or Accidents. The *three* Persons are not *three* parts, either essential or Integral of the God-Head; nor can the relative properties begetting, being begotten, proceeding, be accidents, but substantial attributes, as the absolute properties, Wisdom, Mercy, Justice (for instance:) yet will it not follow, that there are *three* Persons in each Person, that is, that the Persons includes each other, any more, then that these *three* absolute Attributes include each other.

For the Conception or Notion that we have of the Father (suppose) as a subsistent or Person, is *inadequatus conceptus*, in respect of the Divine Essence, considered *as affecta Subsistentia*, or subsisting in divers manners, and so does not include the Son and spirit, who subsist in two different manners from him. And as we cannot say, that the Notion of Justice does include Mercy, or the Notion of Mercy include Justice, though the Divine Essence, or God, be the same with both those properties; so nor can we say, that the Notion of the Father, as one Person in the God-Head, includes the Son; nor the Notion of the Son, as one Person in the God-Head, includes the Father; though each of those Persons are the Divine Essence, or God, [and so, nor does the Father nor Son include the Spirit, or the Spi-

rit

rit include them by the like Reason? which we may thus Illustrate, and indeed confirm, by comparing the Acts of those absolute Attributes, and the properties of those relative Attributes. A punishing, is not an Act of Mercy; nor sparing, a Act of Justice; nor does the one Act include the other: So, nor does the Attributes of Mercy and Justice include each other. So as begetting is not being begotten, nor being begotten is not begetting; so nor does the Notion of the Father include the Son, nor of the Son, include the Father.

4. The fourth is answered in the answer to the second; and we do not affirm the Person in the God-Head, to be finite, but infinite.

5. If those *three* distinct Persons are one with the God-Head, then are they each one with another? That's the sum, though he multiplies words.

Answ. That Argument is grounded (though he does not express, nor perhaps understand it) upon that rule, *Duo conveniunt in uno tertio, conveniunt inter se.* Those things which are one with some third thing, are one among themselves. And I answer, That rule is to be understood, that they are one among themselves, only in respect of that wherein they agree, not simply. As in this plain instance, *David* was a Man, and *Jonson* was a Man, they two agree in a third thing, *viz.* in the humane nature; Will it therefore follow, that they are one Person? nothing less. Though

though the Father be God, and the Son God, it will not follow that they are one Person; for in personality, or manner of subsistence, they differ; but only it will follow, that they are one God, or one in that Divine nature, in which third these two meet.

And now I shall take notice of my Answer to his Question, mentioned p. 10. of his *Sandy Foundation shaken*, and his reply thereto. Where first, the Reader is to know, that *W. P.* conceals his ignorance or falshood in denying that *Person* was a Scripture term, and his front, in demanding an instance with that eagerness, as if none could be given, when I gave him that, *Heb.* 1. 3. Again, whereas he relates my Answer to his Question, of whom Christ was the express Image; that Christ was the express image of Gods subsistence or manner of being, he does me wrong; for, my answer was, that Christ was the express image of God, the Father's Person. That which I spake of a subsistence or manner of being, was in answer to his question: What a Person was. From whence he then inferr'd, that if Christ was the image of his Fathers Person, he must be the image of a mode or manner of being; to which, he received this reply, that Christ was the image of the Father, subsisting in the divine nature, not of the personality or manner of the Fathers being, nor yet of the divine nature in the abstract, (which was illustrated by the Childs bearing the image of his Father.) And so my answer

to his two absurd consequences, will be needless. But if he thinks them deducible from this answer I gave him, I reply thus to them. To the first, *It makes God a Father only by subsistence*, that if he means, that the relation of a Father arises from a personal, not an essential act; I see no absurdity, the immanent act called begetting, is not an act of God absolutely, but relatively considered; that is, of the first Person subsisting in that God-head. To the second, *That Christ is then a Son without a substance.* I answer, that though the Son, as God, is from himself; yet as God the Son, he is from the Father, the person and substance being inseparable. As for the place he refers me to *Col.* 1. 15. *Who is the Image of the invisible God*, I see not how it opposes my exposition. God is taken there personally for the Father, not essentially for the God-head, or divine nature, which I prove, because Christ is said to be the Image of God; which if meant of God essentially, then Christ must be the image of himself, which cannot be. And that Christ is God by nature, appears by *v.* 16. where he is said to be the first cause, and last end of all things. For the translation, it is good enough, *ὑπόστασις* is used by the Greek Phylosophers for *ousia*, which *Aristotle* uses for *substantia prima* and *secunda*; the former of which is, when the common nature expressed in the definition, is restrained by certain proprieties to an individual, which is called *Persona*, or a Person, when the nature is

 indued

induced with reason. *Suppositum*, when it is not. And so ὑπόστασις may by a Metalepsis, yea, must be rendered, Person or subsistent, or some word to that effect, because Christ, as God, is of himself, and so is not the image of any other, there being no multiplication of the divine nature, but of Persons in the nature three.

Vid. Amyrald. de myst. Trin. p. 462, &c. And he that reads *Justin Martyr*, who flourished about *A. D.* 150. will finde that he applies ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον to the Father, Son, and Spirit, which answers *W. P.*'s cavil, that 'tis ὑπόστασις, not πρόσωπον, which is used, *Heb.* 1. 3. and that the word ὑπόστασις was not used in that sense, till *Athanasius*'s time.

Errour 2.

The impossibility of God's pardoning sinners, without plenary satisfaction, refuted. So Pen. *Title page.*

WHere *I* observe, that he argues against the impossibility of God's forgiveness of sin without Satisfaction. Concerning which, stating of the Question, *I* shall say, that either he did, or ought to have known, that many of us, who deny any forgiveness without satisfaction, do not affirm any impossibility of forgiveness without it. And for my own part, though *I* know some worthy persons do deny *W. P.*'s affirmative, yet *I* cannot joyn with them therein. For to me it seems

evident,

evident, that God is free in his determinations, what attribute he will manifest, and in what degree, and manner. Had Man stood, God had only manifested remunerative justice (as he does in the elect Angels:) when Man fell, God might only have manifested vindictive justice (as he does upon the reprobate Angels or Devils:) or sparing mercy only (as he does in the Persons of elect Men.) This variety gives ground to believe, that between these properties, or attributes of justice and mercy (not to speak of others:) and their effects, an act of his meer will intervenes. And neither of these is wronged by the manifestation of the other, and concealment of it self. For the internal glory of none of the divine attributes, receives either addition or diminution by the external glory or manifestation of them, in their proper effects. And as for the way of redemption by Christ, we may well conclude it to be a free choice, by those emphatical phrases, whereby it is set forth, *The counsel of Gods own will*, Eph. 1. 11. *The mystery of his will, his good pleasure.* v. 9. He that desires, may in my weak judgment receive much satisfaction in this point, by that short, but scholastick Tract of the learned *Gilbert*, intituled *Vindiciæ Supremi Dei Dominii, &c.* In this we all agree, that God does not pardon sin without satisfaction first made to his justice by Christ: and he that can make clear proof of this assertion, hath won the Goal from the *Socinians*, and their partakers. As for the possibility, or impossibility

of

of forgiveness without satisfaction, we need not much contest, seeing the cause does not depend upon either apprehension. It was a wise observation of *Aquinas*, *Cumquis ad probandam fidem Christianam inducit rationes, quæ non sunt cogentes, cedit in irrisionem infidelium; credunt enim quod hujusmodi rationibus innitamur, & propter eas credimus, &c. Sum. par.* 1. *Q.* 32. *art.* 1. *&* *Q.* 46 *art.* 2. I need not English the passage, for they who are concerned, understand the School-man without an Interpreter.

But because *W. Pen* does also oppose the fact, and affirms that God pardons sin, without satisfaction made by Christ to his justice, *I* shall therefore briefly explain the terms, and then give you my sense in answer to four Questions. By *pardon of sin*, we understand a gracious absolution, or dissolving of the obligation the sinner is under, to sustain punishment for his sin. That absolution which is not some way gracious, cannot be call'd a pardon. *Satisfaction* is not a Scripture phrase, but the thing is found there. *viz.* a compensation or recompence made to God for the injury done him by our sin, which may be by doing, or suffering, or both: *Justice*, that is, *Vindictive*, God must be considered as a supream Rector or Judge, and not as *Pars Læsa*, the party offended only in the satisfaction made; and if any thing be *done* for satisfaction, (when the letter of the Law requires suffering or undergoing of a penalty therein expressed) it must in

some

some respect or other have *rationem pœnæ*, (as suppose in regard of the person by whom) be penal, and in merit equivalent to what the Law required, and so esteemed by the person, to whose acceptance it is tender'd. The Querys I shall answer to, are;

Qu. 1. What did Christ tender to God for Satisfaction?

Answ. His obedience or subjection to the Law in its penalties or curses. Therefore he is said to be made a curse for us, *Gal.* 3. 13. And also to the Law in its precepts, whence he is said to be made under the Law (*ipso facto*, upon his being made of a Woman) to redeem them that were under the Law. *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. which subjection to the precepts of the Law, was penal, as being a debasement of so great a person; a strange metamorphosis, of an absolute Soveraign into a subject. And therefore 'tis spoken of, as a wonderful instance of condescention, that he was not ashamed to call us brethren. *Heb.* 2. 11. that is, fellow-subjects; for being one in nature with us, he becomes one with us in an obligation to the same Law. And (if it be weighed) the penal nature of what we call penalties or curses, lies not barely in the smart of sense, but in the brand of infamy, thereby set upon us, that we receive the due reward of our deeds (as the good thief gives us his sentiment of his own and fellows case, *Luke* 23. 41.) And seeing that *Satisfaction* in the eye of the Law, is strictly not *solutio ejusdem*, but *tantidem*,

tantidem; not of what the letter of the Law requires, but of somewhat equivalent; therefore it may be made, as well *agendo*, as *patiendo*, by doing, as by suffering. For some actions (as they may be circumstantiated) may be truly penal to the agent, and so equivalent to the corporal punishment, which the letter of the Law exacts, and may be as proper for demonstration of justice, maintaining the repute of the Law, and example to others.

2. *Qu.* What causality, in respect of God's act of forgiveness, Christ's obedience was capable of?

Answ. Christ's obedience could satisfie God, but in *genere causæ moralis sc. impulsive vel meritorie*, as a meritorious cause; of which we say, that *movet aliquem ad talionem reddendam*, which moves another to recompence the act done, by good or ill offices; which we thus express *popularly*, *One good turn requires another*. Which kind of cause works on an agent, and induces him to produce the effect. And that it is such, appears by comparing the causality of his obedience in respect of our impunity or freedome from punishment, with the causality of his, in respect of punishment; which in the latter induces God to punish, in the former, induces God to pardon. If it be said, how can this be, seeing nothing without God can be said to move him? for then somewhat in God should be an effect of the Creature, and so the first cause should have

some

some dependence upon the second, which is absurd and impossible.

I answer, There is no cause indeed of the will of God, *ex parte actus volendi*, as to the act it self of his will: but there may be a cause, *ex parte volitorum*, as to the things will'd: whence the Schools say, *Deus vult hoc esse propter hoc, sed non propter hoc vult hoc*, *i. e.* God wills one thing for another; but why he Wills one thing for another, there's no cause to be assigned, but his Will. God wills the preaching of the Word, for the production of faith, as a means for its end: but why he wills that connexion between them, no reason can be given but his Will, for he can work faith without it. And so Christs obedience cannot properly work upon Gods will, but if it have the causality of an impulsive cause attributed to it, we must understand, that properly those terms note but a connexion between means and end, Christ's Obedience; and the Sinners Pardon, which having been joyned together in God's Decree, cannot be put asunder in the Execution.

Obj. *How does it appear, that Christ's Obedience had the Efficacy of a Meritorious Cause of our Forgiveness?*

Answ. 1. Those places, which speak of the turning away of Divine Wrath, by Christs Obedience; which Wrath, is but an Inclination to punish: He [Christ] is a Propitiator for our sins, ἱλασμὸς, *Propitiatio*, 1 *Joh.* 2. 2. It notes the Act

of

of Appeasing, and the means whereby God is Appeased, *Rom.* 3. 24. ἱλαστήριον. *Propitiatorium*, *The Mercy Seat*, so rendred, *Heb.* 2. the true, as that was the Typical means of Atonement.

2. It appears by those Scriptures, which speak of Redemption or Freedom, from deserved Punishment, purchased by a price of Christs Laying-down, 1 Pet. 18. 19. *Ye were not Redeemed with Corruptible things, as Silver, and Gold but with the precious Blood of Christ.* Where the Antithesis cleerly imports, that Christ's Blood is a True and Real Price, and of far greater Value than Silver, and Gold, which, *Yet answer all things*, *Eccles.* 10. 19. And it hath made a purchase of Freedom from Punishment; for that is included in *the Vain Conversation spoken of*, as an Effect in its Cause; and elsewhere it is spoken of, as a parcel of Christ's purchase, *Gal.* 3. 13. *Christ hath Redeemed us from the Curse of the Law.*

3. By those Scriptures which speak of a Substitution of Christ, for us, *Mat.* 20. 28. *The Son of Man came to give his Life a Ransome for many.* λύτρον, *Res aut factum, quo movetur aut piam, ut aliquam Incommodo alicui affectus, ut liberari Patiatur*, ἀντὶ πολλῶν. Which Preposition, when applied to Persons, imports the Succession of one, into the room of another: so used *Mat.* 2. 22. and rendred *in the room* [of his Father] 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. ἀντίλυτρον. Pretium Redemptionis

demptionis a caunter pria, ἀντί, In Composition, notes, either *Contrarietatem*, as in the Word, ἀντίχριστος; Antichrist, *i. e.* one that opposeth Christ: or it notes, *commutationem*, an exchange of one for another. λύτρον, Notes, something, or Act, whereby, any one is moved to let him go free, whom he hath advantage against. ἀντίλυτρον, Notes, such a kind of λύτρον, or Compensation; as in which, the Deliver undergoes that Evil in kind, or Equivalently, which, he that is delivered, should have undergone. And if the Word imports an Exchange from one Life to another, then we conclude, a Satisfaction from the Nature of the thing. Either justly or unjustly, we were to die; not the latter, for we had well deserved Death, therefore the former. And if Christ hath freed us from that Death we were justly obnoxious to, what is that; but what we call Satisfaction, in the sence of the point in hand.

Quest. 4. *Whence Christ's Obedience, had the Efficiency of a Meritorious Cause of our Forgiveness.*

1. It was a perfect Obedience, 2 *Cor.* 5. *Let he knew no sin*, (*i. e.*) by Experience of the working of it in himself, which *Peter* explains, when he says, *He did no sin*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 22. Thence the Denomination given him,

An holy thing in his Conception, *Luke* 1. 35. *An Holy Child*, Act. 4. 27. After his Birth, παῖς, and

ילד and puer in the Three Learned Languages, signifie a Child (and sometimes a Servant perhaps, because the Child is born a Subject to the parents, *Jure divino Naturali*) *The Holy one of God*] in his Man-hood, even by the Devils, from whom, that Confession was extorted by clear evidence] *Luke* 4:34. And *Holy, Harmless, Undefiled*, separate from Sinners, *Heb.* 7. 26. since he left the Earth.

2. Because Christ's Obedience was not originally due to God; if it had, one debt could not have paid another: I do not mean, that Christ as Man, was not subject to the Law of God, because of the Union of the Humane Nature from the first moment of it's existence to the divine Nature in the Person of the Son of God. For this seems contrary to Scripture, *Gal.* 4. 4. *Made of a Woman, made under the Law*, and the personal Union seems no more to dissolve the Obligation of Christ, as Man to the Law, then to take away the Essential Properties, Parts, or Faculties of Body and Soul (whereof his humane Nature did consist.)

And if that Union did dissolve the Obligation of Christ, as Man, to the Law; then Christ, as Man, could not be Holy by a true Inherent Righteousness of the humane Nature, which lies in the Conformity to the Law of God given thereunto, and so had not been capable of Meriting at all.

But in two respects, may Christ's obedience

be said, not to be Originally due.

1. In that he being a Person, before he became Man, he was at his Election, whither he would become Man, or not; that is, a rational Creature, which, of course, or *ipso facto*, (as we say) upon it's existence, becomes a Subject, as the Connexion imports, *Made of a Woman, made under the Law*, Gal. 4. 4. and so had the refusal of being under the Law, and he became Man, that he might come under the Law.

2. When he was Man, he was not under an Obligation to obey to any such ends, as to satisfie divine Justice, and merit Life, for them who had demerited Death. For it not being in the compass of any meer Mans power, there was no such Obligation upon any meer Man, as to obey or suffer, by way of Satisfaction, for another man's Disobedience; or to recover thereby the happiness another man had lost, and make a new purchase of what he had forfeited, and God had seized into his own hands.

3. The third Ground of the merit of Christ's Obedience, is the Dignity of the Person: I know not what other reason, but the Dignity resulting from the Divine Nature, to the Humane, that the Blood of the Son of man, is called the Blood of God, Acts 20. 28. *God purchased the Church with his own Blood*. The action of one Nature, is the action of the whole Person, [*duæ unes sunt Suppositorum*, we say in the Schools, and we distinguish, between *Principium quo*, and *quod*

quod.] A man is said to think, and to speak, because they are both the acts of the Person, though the one he does by vertue of his Soul, the other of his Body. And as sence is dignified by being under the command of Reason, in a man, which it is not under, in a Bruit, so is the Humane Nature by Union to the Divine. As for the Cavil of *Socinians*, (whose Vomit, the *Quakers* have now licked up) that the dignity of the Person comes not under Consideration, because tis not the God-head, or Divine Nature that suffers, it is very futilous. They might with as much reason, say tis all one, whither I strike my Prince, or a private Person, or an Enemy, or my Father, because my blows do not fall upon Authority, or Relation, but on the person in Dignity, or related to me (as *Grotius* well observes, *De Satisf. Chr. c.8.*)

And it contradicts the common sence of all Nations, who proportion their Punishment to the dignity of the Person injured. I shall answer one Objection, though not in *W. Pens* Book.

Object. *How can God be said to forgive freely, when he requires Satisfaction? Are not these two Contradictory?*

Answ. 1. There is no contradiction between Forgiveness, and Satisfaction, because they are not *ad idem*, they respect not the same Persons. If Satisfaction were required of us, we could not be said to be forgiven.

Answ. 2. There are divers acts of Grace, whereby God makes way for Satisfaction, and the benefits of it.

1. A Relaxation of the Law; which term in the Civil Law, notes an Act of a Superiour, whereby the Obligation of a Law in force, is taken away, as to some Persons and things. In the case before us, there was such an act of Gods, whereby he admits a surety, whereas the Law threatned the Sinner himself. A relaxation of the Law, I say, there was, as that is opposed to an Abrogation, which is not here, for then the Elect, whilst Sinners in state, were not under the Curse of the Law, which to affirm, were to contradict the Apostle, *Gal.* 3. 13. and as a Relaxation is opposed to a favourable Interpretation, κατ' ἐπιείκειαν, for then the surety were in the primary Obligation, as when one Person enters into a Recognisance with another, for his appearance in Court. But Christ was not bound with Man in the Covenant of Works, to see the Law kept, or undergo the penalty which Relaxation was an Act of Soveraignty: to the exercise wherof, his own grace and nothing foreseen in us did prompt him.

2. Another act of Gods Grace, is the Nomination and Appointment of a surety; Christ was made a *surety*, *Heb.* 7. 21. and by the Father, *Heb.* 10. 7. I come to do thy will, sayes Christ to his Father, of his undertakement as our surety; which is an act of Grace, for the Debtor, not the Creditor; the Malefactor, not the Judge,

is

is to find a surety. A Representation of both these acts we have, *Gen.* 22. 2. 13. where God admitted, and provided a, *Ram* for a Sacrifice, instead of *Isaac*; though the Letter of the Command was to offer *Isaac* himself.

3. Gods Actual Acceptance, the Payment or Satisfaction, made and tendered by Christ, which appears as otherwise, so especially

1. By his Resurrection, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. God manifest in the Flesh, was justified in the Spirit; that is, by his God-head [so called, because tis in Nature *Spiritual*, 1 *John* 4. 24.] compared with 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. where tis said of Christ, *That he was put to death in the Flesh, but quickned by the Spirit*; that is, his Humane and Divine Nature. And they instruct us in this Truth, that Christ's Resurrection, was not only an Effect of Divine Power, but also of Christs Justification from our sin, charged upon him in his Death; and so a Foundation laid for our Actual Forgiveness, to be built on by Faith.

That passage also contributes some Assistance, *Math.* 28. *vers.* 3. where the Angels of the Lord descended from Heaven, *and rold away the Stone from the Door of the Sepulchre*, which would have been an Impediment to his getting out. For what can the Creditors release of the Surety out of Prison signifie, but that he is satisfied, and the Debt paid?

2. By his Intercession; which being grounded upon his Satisfaction, supposes it to be what it

pretends, full and compleat; and being an Application to Grace, supposes that satisfaction to be *Solutio recusabilis*, refusable payment; for in Obligations which arise *ex delicto*, from an Offence committed, *Dum alius solvit, aliud solvitur*, (as *Grotius* speaks, *De Satis Chr. c. 7.* when another Person [then what was originally obliged] makes payment [of the Debt of punishment, due to Justice] another thing is paid [then what the Law required,] As suppose, for one man to offer to die for another, is no more in the Eye of the Law, than to offer himself to be Whipped, to save the others Life; For the Judge can no more admit of Exchange of Person, than of Penalty.

4. Another act of Grace is in the means of Application, of that Satisfaction he exacts of Christ; I mean Faith in Christ: the formal Act whereof, as Justifying seems best placed in an Acceptance of Christ, for Justification, that being the correlate of the offer of Christ for that end in the Gospel. Here appears a double act of Grace. 1. In the choice of this Means of Application, an acceptance looking least like a Meritorious Act. 2. In the bestowing of it, Faith being the gift of God. The Apostle suggests both, when he says, *We are saved by Grace, through that Faith, which is not of our selves*, Eph. 2. 8.

W. Pens Scriptures, from *p.* 16. to 20. proves only what we grant, (*viz.*) *That God does freely pardon Sin, but, not that he pardons Sin without*

Satis-

Satisfaction; only we may observe, how in the Enumeration of those Names of God which import free Forgiveness, he leaves out that Name (which is sub-joyned to them as a Limitation.) *That will by no means clear the Guilty*, Exod. 34. 7. That is not contrary to the order of Justice, which he hath prescribed, which order, is to require that Satisfaction of the surety, which is remitted to the Principal. From *Mat.* 6. 12. *Forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors*, he seems to offer at an Argument.

Arg. If it be our duty to forgive without a Satisfaction received, and God is to forgive us, *as we forgive them*, then is a Satisfaction totally excluded, p. 18.

Answ. 1. There is an agreement between Gods Forgiveness and ours. 1. In respect of the *causa Procatarctica*, or inward moving Cause, called *Kindness*, *Tender-Heartedness*, Eph. 4. 32. 2. In respect of the Effect, which in both, is the Offenders Impurity.

But it will not follow there must be a similitude every way. *Pen* might with as much shew of Reason, infer from *Eph.* 4. 32. *Forgiving one another, even as God for Christs sake hath forgiven you*; that seeing we are to forgive, as God does us, therefore we are not to forgive another, but for the sake of some Third Person, who hath interest in us.

Answ. 2. We are not bound in all cases, to forgive another without Satisfaction. *If he repent, forgive him; if he turn again to thee, saying I*

repent, thou shalt forgive him, Luke 17. 3, 4. Man as a Judge, may not forgive without Satisfaction to Law.

Arg. From *Mat.* 18. 27, 33. he infers, that it had been no fault in the Servant, not to have forgiven his Brother without Satisfaction, if the Kings Mercy had not been proposed for his Example.

Answ. 1. That wherein the Comparison lies, is the Forgiveness it self; not the manner of Forgiveness: There is ground enough for a Comparison, between Persons, or things, if there be likeness in any one respect: *See vers.* 35.

2. If we stick in the Letter of the Parable, God is represented under another σχέσις, habitude or Consideration, than in the Doctrine of Satisfaction now under debate. For, here he is considered as Rector, or Governour; but there as a Creditor, and so as a private Person. In the Doctrine of Satisfaction, God discharges from Obligations, *Ex delicto*, or debts due to Justice, by Offence committed against the *Law*.

In the Parable, God discharges from an Obligation, *Ex contractu*, arising from Covenant or Contract: So is a man made a debtor to a private Person. And there's not the same reason in many respects, for Forgiveness without Satisfaction in both cases; nor to Execute Penal Laws, is to disparage the Legislative Authority. Hence the Rule in Politicks, τὸν κειμένων ἰσχυρῶς μαλακίζειν, not easily to relax Laws once Established.

His

His first Absurdity, p. 20. I pass by, having declared my sence about the possibility of pardoning sin without Satisfaction.

Abs. 2. *That the Creature is more capable of extending Forgiveness, than the Creator.*

Answ. All that will follow from our Doctrine, is, that there is great difference between Gods condition and ours, his Majesty and our meanness, that we have no reason to stand so much upon our Terms, and to have such a Sentiment of affronts done to us, there being an equality between us and our Brethren, but an Infinite inequality between God and us.

Abs. 3. *That God so Loved the World, as to give his only Son for to save it, and yet, that God stood off in Displeasure, till Christ satisfied his Justice,* page 20.

Answ. To clear this, observe that Divines distinguish of *Tria momenta Divinæ voluntatis*, three steps or degrees of Divine Love to Mankind.

1. Before Christs Satisfaction, God is not wholly averse from Reconciliation on good Terms, (though he be throughly angry with us.) For if he had been resolved to stand to the Rigor of the Law, and not admit of any Satisfaction, there had been an end of our Salvation.

2. Upon Christs Satisfaction, he does not only determine, but promise to lay his Anger aside.

3. Upon Actual Faith, he layes aside his Anger quite, and becomes our Friend.

W. Penn

W. Pens Reasons why Christ could not satisfie Gods Justice, as man, or as God singly, *I* pass by, though I might except against some of them, as not *cogent*, though the thing be true, and owned by us.

But his reason; why Christ could not satisfie as God-man, is absurd in phrase and sence. For, where two *Mediums*, or middle Propositions are singly inconsistent, with the Nature of the end, for which they were at first propounded, their Conjunction does rather Augment than lessen the difficulty of its accomplishment.

His meaning is, I think, that where two things singly will not attain any end, for which they are used as means, much less will they attain it together: As if he should say, two men can much less bear a *Burden*, when joyned together, which neither of them alone can bear; or rather, as if he should say, *Lazarus* Soul without his Body could not speak, nor his Body without the Soul in their Separation; therefore in their Union or Conjunction, at his Resurrection, much less could he speak. *I* refer you to what hath been said before of the value of Christs Obedience, arising from the Dignity of his Person.

To his Consequences *Irreligious* and *Irrational*, *I* shall say a little. In the two first, *I* am not concerned, because they militate against the Impossiblity of Forgiveness without Satisfaction, which I do not affirm.

Cons. 3. *That it was unworthy of God to pardon,*

but

but not to inflict punishment on the Innocent, or require a Satisfaction where there was Nothing due.

Answ. 1. *I* do not say (nor do we generally) that it was unworthy of God, to pardon Sin without Satisfaction, because he did not think fit to do it. That will be no better Consequence, than to say, if it had pleased God to Create the World. *Then it had been unworthy of God, not to have Created it.*

For God proceeded on good Grounds, in re-resolving the *contrary*.

1. For though his Love to Righteousness, and Hatred of Sin, had been never the less; if he had not punished Sin, yet man might have been apt to have mis-judged him. The sinner concluded God to be such an one as himself, (*i.e.* one that made as light a matter of sin as he did) because of Gods patience towards him, *Psal.* 50. 21.

2. Impunity might have been abused for an Incouragement to sin, *Eccles.* 8. 11. and other reasons might be given.

3. The reason; why it was not unworthy of God to punish the Innocent, is, because of his free consent, and *Volenti non fit injuria*; and because as God he had a Soveraign, and as man, a special deputed Power over his life, and the comforts of it, *Joh.* 10. 18. He had a *commandment* to lay down his Life.

3. According to *Pen's* Opinion; Christ, though Innocent, and but a meer-Man, Suffered only

for

for an Example, p. 19. and why not then for Satisfaction to Divine Justice, that being a Nobler design?

4. Christ when he suffered, was not *Innocent*, and when God required Satisfaction of him, it was due from him. Christ was guilty of our sin, when he suffered for it. For Guilt is but *Obligatio ad Pœnam*, an Obligation to undergoe Punishment, which Christ was under by Contract; Christ was a *surety*, *Heb.* 7. 22. when our debt was demanded of him. And the *surety* is as truly a Debtor as the Principal, though the manner of becomming such be different.

Conf. 4. It deprives God of the Praise of his Love.

Conf. 6. It Robs God of the Gift of his Son for our Redemption.

Conf. 8. Then we are not beholding to God.

Answ. I put these together, because he here contradicts himself; for if the Son was God's Gift for our Redemption, how are we not beholden to God? or how is God deprived entirely of the praise of his Grace in our Redemption?

Conf. 5. It represents the Son more kind than the Father; whereas, if he be the same God, then either the Father is as loving as the Son, or the Son as angry as the Father.

Answ. 1. Consider, the Father and Son as God, they are equally kind to Mankind, and equally angry at mans sin, as appears by their purposes of

of Mercy, and Punishment, discovered in the Promises and Threatnings.

2. Our Doctrine represents not the Son kinder than the Father, but intimates a distinct manner and order of Kindness or Operation, about our Salvation, answerable to the order of their being; that as the Father is the first, so the Contrivement of our Redemption, is more peculiarly his Act, the Undertakement of our actual Redemption, peculiarly the Act of the Son. It is a rule in Divinity, *Unum idemq; opus* [or *operatio vel actio* rather *Opus enim est effectus actionis*] *ad extra diverso respectu Personale est, & essentiale.* External Actions of God are in a diverse respect, Essential and Personal. The Decree of the Son of Gods Incarnation, the Creation of his Body and Soul, the parts of that Nature he subsisted in, were Acts common to Father and Son as one God, or essential Acts; but the Election of the Son to be our Redeemer in our Nature, is the peculiar Act of the Father; The assumption of our Nature, the peculiar Act of the Son, or personal Act.

Conf. 6. It Robs God of the Gift of his Son for our Redemption, in affirming, the Son purchased that Redemption from the Father, by giving himself to God as our Compleat Satisfaction.

Ans. No such matter. The designation of the Son of God to be our Redeemer, considered, as the Fathers personal act is a fruit of the meer

love

love of God the Father: yet the actual collation of Redemption in its effects and benefits, depends on Christs purchase: or as the Schools distinguish, the *actus volendi*, or the Fathers gift of the Son for our Redemption (to use *Pen*'s phrase) depends on nothing without himself: but the *res volita*, or the Redemption it self, our actual freedom from sin and wrath depends on what Christ did and suffer'd, as an end upon its means.

Cons. 7. By Christs payment of our debt it is not forgiven, but transferd, we owing that now to the Son, which was owing before to the Father.

Ans. He might as well say, when a surety pays the debt, the debtor owes that to the surety, he owed before to his Creditor, and so he is no better provided for than before, (to use *W. P*'s words) which is not true, but when counter-security is given the surety by the principal.

Cons. 8. If Gods justice be satisfied for sins past, present, and to come, God and Christ have lost their power of injoyning godliness, and punishing disobedience.

Ans. 1. Christs obedience was not intended to exempt us from a personal obedience to the Law, but from it only as a condition of life. And we are only so far made righteous by Christs obedience, as we are unrighteous by our own disobedience.

2. God cannot punish disobedience by vertue of the Covenant of works upon a justified person,

son, for then he should exact satisfaction of the Debtor, after he had received it of the surety. And why may we not say, God cannot do, what were unjust for him to do? A moral, though not a natural impotency may be ascribed to God.

Error 3.

That we are not justified by imputed righteousness, W. Pen.

THe word *justifie* δικαιω and δικαιοῦμαι, and the *Heb.* צדק signifies *justum facere*, and in the Scripture usage, it is a soren-sick word, and signifies to pronounce righteous, and so is opposed to condemnation and accusation, *Rom.* 8.33. The word impute λογίζομαι properly signifies the same with ἀναλογίζω *supputo*, to cast account, and the *Heb.* חשב signifies to think, imagine, and reason, and hence in Scripture it is applied to a legal act, whereby the righteousness of one, *viz.* Christ is admitted for another, and so far accounted and esteemed that others, as that he obtains the benefit of it, to all intents and purposes, as if it had been his personal righteousness. I shall produce for the word and thing but one Scripture, which is express for us, *Rom.* 4. 6. *As David describes the blessedness of the Man, to whom the Lord imputeth Righteousness without Works*, [that is the Righteousness of another, without Works of her own, else there were contradictio

reddicio in adjecto.] And observe, the Apostle gives us the sum of *Davids* Words, *vers.* 7, 8. which speak not of Imputation of Righteousness in terms, but of Forgiveness, and not imputing Sin, which must be supposed to lie in Imputation of Righteousness, as Effects in their Cause. Now in absolutely free Forgiveness, there's no Imputation of Righteousness, but what is our own inherently, according to *Pen*, and other *Socinians*.

Three Arguments will suffice to evince the Truth on our side.

Arg. 1. From the proportion which our Justification by Christs Righteousness bears to our Condemnation by *Adam's* Sin, but our Condemnation was by Imputation of *Adams* Sin. Therefore our Justification is by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, *Rom.* 5. 19. points us out to this Collation; *As by one mans Disobedience, many were made Sinners: so by the Obedience of one, shall many be made Righteous.*

Arg. 2. From the proportion, which our being made Righteous, bears to Christs, being made Sin. But Christ was made Sin by Imputation. Therefore so are we *made Righteous*, 2 *Cor* 5. *ult*, gives ground for Arguing from such Proportion; *For he was made Sin for us, who knew no Sin*, [i.e. by an Experimental knowledge of its Operation in himself, *Peter* therefore sayes, *he did no Sin*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21.] that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him.

Arg.

Arg. 3. From the proportion, which Imputation of Righteousnels to us, bear to the matter of our Justification, which (as we have shewn before) being the Righteousness of another, cannot be made ours any other way, than by Imputation. So, and no otherwise, the *sureties* payment of the Debt becomes the Act of the principal Debtor.

This last Argument suggests an Answer to *W. P's* Cavils about the word *Impute*, that it is altogether used to express what is personally theirs, of whom it is spoken, *p.* 29. For supposing it were so ordinarily, yet when it is applied to the act of one person, by Operation of Law made another, it cannot be so meant. For it is a good rule, *Verba intelliguntur secundum Subjectam materiam*, words are to be interpreted, when ambigious, according to their Subject matter. I shall propose, and answer one Objection of another *Quakers*, before I come to *Penn*.

Obj. How can God account us to have done what we have not? So *Whitehead, Voyce of Wisdom.* 3. Head.

Sol. We must not fancy any misapprehension or false Judgment in God: God does not (to speak strictly) account us to have done and suffered what we did not, as the Creditor does not account the principal to have paid the debt, which he knows the *surety* paid for him. But God admits of what Christ did for our behoof, as if it had been our personal Act. As the Cre-

 ditor

ditor Cancels the Bond, lets the Debtor out of Prison, and gives him every way as Legal a Discharge upon the *sureties* Payment of the debt, as he could have done upon his Personal Payments.

Next, *I* shall take notice of *Pens* Scriptures and Arguments.

As for *Exod.*23.1. *Prov.* 17.15. one answer will serve both. God does not, nor allowes he Man to justifie the Wicked, *In sensu composito*, as we say whilst he is such; nor does God justifie the the Wicked, in justifying those to whom Righteousness is Imputed, for by that Imputation, they are first made Righteous, and then Justified, or Legally declared to be Righteous: So that unless you will deny, that the Act of one Person may by contract, or Act of Law, become the Act of another, as was above explained, there's no weight in your Allegations. As for *Exek.* 18. 20. *The Son shall not bear the Iniquity of his Father.*

Answ. Exod. 34 7. One of God's names is, *Visiting the Iniquity of the Fathers, upon the children*, &c. Thus then we collect, that this place signifies Gods Perpetual and Immutable right, which to us seems to be equitable, in regard of the neer Conjunction between Parent and Child, (the Child being but the Parent multiplied.) That in *Ezekiel*, Imports Gods gracious Recession from his right, because of their more than ordinary audasity, in charging his wayes

with

with inequality, *verſ.* 25. *verſ.* 3. he tells them they ſhould not have occaſion any more to uſe that Proverb, *verſ.* 2. the meaning whereof, was, *verſ.* 19. *The Son bears the Iniquity of his Father*; which implies, they had had occaſion to uſe it. See *Joſh.* 22.17. 2 *Sam.* 21.9, 14. Inſtances of the *Jews* Children, bearing the *Iniquity* of their Fathers.

But ſuppoſe that were Gods ſtanding Rule, yet he might in Soveraignty, relax his Law, ſo far as to admit of Chriſt, a *ſurety*, inſtead of the Malefactors: and that he hath done, *I* have proved before.

As for all the reſt, they deſigne to prove, we are juſtified by an Inherent, and ſo not by an *Imputed* Righteouſneſs. The chief, *I* anſwered before, on the Head of Juſtification: The reſt are obvious.

Arg. 1. *God cannot Juſtifie what is oppoſite to his pure Nature.*

Anſw. Nor does God juſtifie what is oppoſite to his pure Nature, in juſtifying a Perſon in himſelf impure, upon the Righteouſneſs of another, imputed to him. For, ſuppoſing the right of Soveraignty veſted in God, to admit of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, for our perſonal Righteouſneſs, and an intimate Conjunction between Chriſt and us, as one in Nature, and myſtically by Faith, when God juſtifies a Perſon for imputed Righteouſneſs; he juſtifies one as truly (though not in the ſame manner) Righteous,

as if he had been perionally Righteous.

Arg. 2. *If man were justified by Innocency before the Fall, then so must he be justified after it.*

Answ. We deny the Consequence, because man having broken the Covenant made with him, God was at his free choice, how he would deal with him, (and that God did not think fit to justifie Man by a personal Innocency or Righteousness, *I* shall prove, under the *4th.* Head of *Errours*) which *I* presume *Pen* understands; for otherwise, we are since the Fall, justified by Innocency, or a perfect Righteousness, as before it, we should have been, only the manner of Communication is different; the one by a Physical, the other by a Legal Act or Operation.

Arg. 3. *Sin came not by Imputation, but actual Transgression.*

Answ. The Sin of *Adam* was made his posterities, *Rom.* 5. 12, 14. by Imputation: *Adam* was a Common Root to Mankind by Nature, but a Common Person by Divine Constitution, in that positive Precept and Threat, *Gen.* 2. 17. and the Promise therein inculded, in case of Obedience; whence as if he had stood, we had all stood in him; so he Falling, we all Fell, or *Sinned in him*, as the Apostles Phrase is, *Rom.* 5. 12. And thence the Apostle argues, *That as by one mans Disobedience many were made Sinners, so by the Obedience of one, shall many be made Righteous*, Rom. 5. 19.

Arg. 4. A *man cannot be said to be actually Sinful*,

ful, and Imputatively Righteous: He may as well be said to be actually Damned, and Imputatively Saved.

Answ. Why not, as well as to say, a man is actually poor, not worth a Groat: but imputatively Rich, as having by his Surety, paid his debt of Thousands; or to say, the nine Men throughout a mutinous Army, are actually Guilty, and yet imputatively Innocent, when the tenth man is admitted to sustain the punishment due to the rest. Yet there's not the like reason to say, a man is actually Damned, and imputatively Saved; no more then to say, a man is actually dead, and imputatively alive: for *Imputation* is an act of Law, and makes only a relative, not a real change, as from being condemned to be justified, not from being dead, to be alive.

W. P's Consequences, are some the same with his Arguments, as 1, 2, 3, 6. and so answered already and the other three are co-incident upon the matter; and the sum of them is, that if we be justified by imputed Righteousness, there is no need of Inherent Righteousness.

Answ. There is no need of *Inherent* righteousness for Justification, but yet there is need of it as to other ends, as to make us meet for Heaven, *Col.* 1.12. The different use or need of imputed and personal Righteousness, may be expressed by this Similitude, Legitimation gives a right in Law to our *Parents* estate.

The use of reason, gives a natural capacity of

injoying it. *Imputed* Righteousness, gives us a Title to the Heavenly Inheritance. *Inherent*, gives us a fitness for the enjoying of it, (it lying in communion with God;) without likeness of disposition, there can be no liking of each other.

Errour, 4.

That our Good Works (as they are wrought in the Spirit) are a Meritorious (or deserving) Cause of our Justification. Geo. Whitehead, Voyce of Wisdom p. 19. *Printed* 1659. *The Arguments I urge against this Errour, are Three.*

Arg. 1. OUr good Works fall short of the rule of Justification, which is the whole Law. *Rom.* 8. 3. *What the Law could not do, in that it was weak, through the Flesh, God sending his own Son, &c.* The sum of the Verse is, that Christ was sent to fulfull the Law for our Justification, which we could not do our selves, through our corruption, which makes us as averse, so impotent, to Obedience of the Law.

Arg. 2. That we should be justified by our good Works, is inconsistent with the professed end of God, in the way of our Justification; which is, that *whosoever Glorieth, may Glory in the Lord, vers.* 31. Which Affirmative implies the Negative, spoken

of

of on another account, *vers.29. That no Flesh may Glory in his presence.* But if we be justified by our good Works, all Glorying is not taken away from us: as appears by *Rom.3.27. Where is boasting then? it is excluded: By what Law? of Works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith.* I mean (and so does the Apostle) such glorying or boasting, as the creature is capable of. The Apostle tells us indeed, that if *Abraham were justified by Works, he hath whereof to Glory, but not before God,* Rom. 4.2. I suppose, partly because all his strength (and so proportionably any of ours, so justified) to do those Works, was originally from God (which consideration is suggested, to check our boasting, either of Gifts or Graces;) *What hast thou, that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou Glory, as if thou hadst not received it?* 1 Cor. 4.7. And partly because we have an immediate dependance upon God in our Operations, *John 15.5. Without me, ye can do nothing,* χωὶς ἐμοῦ, *Seorsima me,* separate, or apart from me, relating to that mystical Union between Christ and his People, whereby their dependance upon him in all the good they do, is as neer and intimate, as that of the Branches upon the Vine, by vertue of their natural Union, in the bearing any Fruit. So the 4 *verse* states the Comparison, *As the Branch cannot bear Fruit of it self, except it abide in the Vine, no more can we, except ye abide in me.*

3. There is no natural Equivalency between

our good Works, and a Reward, as there seems to be between our Evil Works, and Punishment, though the Law had expressed no penalty.

What boasting then you will ask, is the Creature capable of, and hath he ground for, in Justification by his own good Works or Righteousness? *I* answer, That there comes nothing, as the reason or Meritorious Cause of the reward promised, between the promise of Reward to our Good Works, and the performance of it; but the goodness of our Works, or their conformity to the rule, the Law of God. The truth of this will appear, if we compare the Tenor of the Covenant of Works, and Grace, *Gal.* 3. That no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God, is evident; *For the just shall live by Faith, and the Law is not of* Faith; *but the man that doth them*, [i. e. the many things contained in the Law] *shall live in them.* vers. 11. 12. Tis evident to any attentive *Reader*, that a comparison is here made between the two Covenants in point of Justification; and their difference lies in this, that in the one, the doer of the Law lives in or by it; but the just [*Evangelically*] lives by Faith, not by Faith as a Work (for, considered as such, Faith being opposed to the deeds of the Law, is opposed to, and excludes it self) but Faith is metonymically put for its object, Christ closed with for Justification, or Righteousness of Christ made ours by Faith, called therefore,

Righteous-

Righteousness through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousness which is of God, by Faith, viz. in respect of the actual Collation or bestowing of it, not of the Provision or Preparation of it, for that is before Faith) *Phil.* 3. 9. And because God designs to take away glorying in Justification, Faith in God through the *Messias*, is called *a Walking humbly with God*, Micah. 6. 8. That it does relate to the Law of Faith, and but only by consequence, if at all, not directly to the Law of Providence, or Submission to afflictions, I am induced to believe upon these two grounds:

1. Because otherwise God returns no answer (which he seems plainly to designe) to the Query, what the Lord will be pleased with, or what Satisfaction shall be given him for *Israels* sin, which is the sum of the Questions, *vers.* 7. *Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of Rams, or with ten thousands of Rivers of Oyl? Shall I give my first-Born for my Transgression, the fruit of my Body for the Sin of my Soul?* But understanding it thus, there is a plain Answer, (*viz.*) I do not expect any Righteousness of thy gift, but of thy acceptance: or thus, I shall not be pleased with any Righteousness which thou bringest, unless it be what I have first bestowed on thee by Faith.

2. The Pride of mans heart makes him as loath to accept of a Righteousness freely offered him, as to accept of the punishment of his Iniquity justly afflicted. It makes him as loath to part with the priviledge he had in the Old Covenant

nant, as he that hath set up for himself some time, is to turn an Apprentice: and therefore, tis as true an act of Humility, to accept of Gods Righteousness, as of his Chastisments for Sin.

Arg. 3. If Righteousness were by the Law, (*i.e.* by our personal Obedience to it) then Christ died in vain; they are the Apostles own Words, *Gal.* 2. 21. which we may make a perfect Hypothetical Syllogisme, by adding the Minor. But Christ died not in vain, and the Conclusion, therefore Righteousness comes not by the *Law.*

δωρεὰν. *Gratis immerito,* without sufficient Cause.

The reason of the Consequence in the Major, which the Apostle affords us, is, because the end of Christs Death was to provide us a Righteousness, to be tendred to Gods acceptance, and which (supposing the Covenant of Grace) he neither would, nor could refuse: But if we have Righteousness sufficient for the end of Righteousness, Justification; the Righteousness provided by Christ, comes a-day after the Fair, (as we say) too late to bestead us. Christ's end in his Death, was to do that for us (in point of Justification) which we could not do for our selves, (as may well be inferred, from the place touched at above, *Rom.* 8. 3. 4.)

The

The Scriptures they alledge, are;

Arg. 1. James 2.24. *A man is justified by Works, and not by Faith onely.*

Answ. If we take Justification in a proper sence, for the Absolution or Acquitting of a Sinner, this place would contradict that in *Rom.* 3.28. Therefore we conclude, *that a man is justified by Faith, and not by the Deeds of the Law.* But there is alway a sweet consent, though sometimes a seeming dissent between one Scripture and another.

I therefore distinguish between Justification, as it imports, the Absolution of a Sinner, and as it imports, the Approbation of a Believer. I also distinguish the word, *Faith*, as it is taken, for a living, or for a dead Faith; that is, for the reality of Faith, or the bare Profession. And then I answer, that *James* tells us, how a Man is declared or manifested to be a justified Person, (*viz.*) not by a profession of Faith only, but by Works also; we are justified by Works, as our *Faith is made perfect by Works*, Jam. 2.22. that is declaratively. Faith is declared or evidenced to be perfect; that is, sincere and true by Works. As the Tree is not made, but shewn to be good by the Fruit it bears. And hence tis said, that *Faith without Works is dead*, vers. 20. *It* is so, and appears to be so, as the Tree that bears not at all. And the scope of the place is to convince the

Hypo-

Hypocrites, that said they had *Faith*, and had none, as appears, *vers.*14. and onward. Whereas *Paul* in the other place, *Rom.* 3, 28. shews us how a Sinner is formally justified in the sight of God, *viz. by a True Faith in Christ*, as will appear to him that observes *vers.*25,26. where God is said to justifie him that believes in Jesus; *Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood.*

*Arg.*2. Rom.8.2,4. *The Law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the Law of Sin and Death. That the Righteousness of the Law may be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the Flesh but after the Spirit.* From the first of these *verses* they conclude, that we are made free Meritoriously by the Law of the Spirit in us, from the Law of *Sin* and Death, because it is the same Law of the Spirit of Life that is in Christ, and the Saints. From the second they observe, that the Righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in the Persons of the Saints.

Ans. To the second Verse, theirs cannot be the meaning of the Text: For, supposing a state of freedome from sin attainable in this life, and that by the Law of sin and death, is meant only death, the fruit of sin: yet how can there be any colour for merit of justification, when the very priviledge of that state addes to those obligations, by which all the service our capacity will extend to, had been due to God, if we had never sinned? Two other Sences indeed the words seem

seem to learned Men not uncapable of.

1. That the Apostle gives a reason of the connexion between justification and sanctification, because the same Christ Jesus that justifies by his blood, sanctifies by his spirit. So *Calvin, &c. in loc.* 2. That they contain the meritorious cause of that justification, which is evidenced by an holy life, *viz.* the active obedience of Christ. So *Beza.* And to this *I* rather incline.

As for *Ver.* 4. some understand them to note this end of Christs sending into the World, *viz.* that Gods righteous Laws might not be absolutely contemned, and so given in vain; but might be observed (though imperfectly) by believers. Others, of the imputation of Christs surety, righteousness, *Fide jussoria justitia.* The *Quakers* to be sure mistakes; for I shall shew under the next head, no perfect personal righteousness is attainable in this life.

Arg. 3. *If* our evil works are the meritorious cause of our condemnation, then our good works are the meritorious cause of our justification. But the antecedent is true, therefore the consequent. *S. Fishers* dispute at *Sandwich.*

The consequence he proves from that Rule in Logick, *Contraria contrariorum ratio,* of contraries there is a contrary reason or consequence.

Ans. We deny the consequence of the major.

1. Because our good, and our evil works, are not perfectly contrary. For our evil works are perfectly evil; for *malum fit ex quilibet defectu.*

Any

Any one defect makes our works evil: but our good works are but imperfectly good. For, *Bonum fit ex integris causis.* There must be a conformity in all respects to the Law to make our works good. For that Rule on which *Fisher* grounds his consequence, holds only of immediate or perfect contraries, not of mediate. And so his consequence is but like this. If cold Water will chill a Man's body, luke-warm Water will scald it.

2. Because there is no condignity in our good works, were they perfectly good; There cannot be a proportion between a finite work, and infinite reward. 'Tis true, the Apostle says, To him that worketh, the reward is reckon'd not of grace, but of debt. *Rom.* 4. 4 But it is to be understood of a debt, *Ex pacto gratiæ non ex operis dignitate*, due by promise, not by any merit preceding the promise.

Arg. 4. Rom. 2. 13. Not the hearers of the Law are just before God, but the doers of the Law shall be justified. *Pen.* p. 26.

Ans. The words give the reason of their perishing, who had the Law, (*viz.*) the *Jews*, because God cannot justifie any on the terms of the old Covenant, that do not perfectly fulfill it; which the *Jews* were far enough from being able to do, or indeed from indeavouring it. They pleased themselves in their priviledges, and external acts of worship (for which, hearing is put by a Synecdoche) as equivalent in merit to a perfect legal righteousness.

Error 5.

Errour 5.

That a state of freedome from sin, is attainable in this Life.

AGainst this Error, I urge two Arguments: 1. If no meer Man ever attained to any such state, then it is not attainable. But no meer Man ever did, &c.

The consequence carries great probability of truth. As for the minor, that no Man ever did attain a state of perfection, we may prove by the instances of the eminently holy Persons in the Scripture, who in all likelihood would have attained it, had it been attainable. I know the *Quakers* do give instances of meer Men in Scripture, that were perfect: but their mistake lies in the different use of that word (as we shall see by and by.)

Arg. 2. If there be a continual need and use of faith, and repentance in this life, then a state of freedome from sin is not attainable in this life. But there is a continual need and use of faith, and repentance in this life; Therefore a state of freedome from sin is attainable in this life. The Consequence is evident; What need can he have of repentance for sin, that hath no sin to repent of? or of faith in Christ for pardon and power against sin, who is already free from what contracts guilt and defilement? That there is continual

rimal use of faith (and there's the like reason of repentance) appears from 1 *Cor.* 13. *ult.* Now abide, Faith, Hope and Charity, these three, but the greatest of these, is Charity. See *p.* 33.

By Charity, ἀγάπη, we are to understand love to God, as well as to our Neighbour, as is evident by *Ver.* 3. between which, and faith, and hope, the Apostle states the comparison in respect of their duration; that when the two former shall cease, the latter shall abide. Charity, or love, suits our future perfect, as well as our present imperfect state; but faith and hope suit only our present and imperfect state.

The Quakers Arguments are drawn,

1. From the word perfect. *Phil.* 3. 15. and elsewhere applied to Saints on Earth.

Ans. The word *perfect* is sometimes used absolutely, 1 *Cor.* 13. 10. opposed to what is in part, and sometimes comparatively, *Phil.* 3. 15. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: Yet *Ver.* 12. he says, Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect. He denies in one Verse, what he affirms in the other, and so contradicts himself, if the word *perfect* be in both places understood in the same sence. But 'tis evident, that in the 15. ver. perfect is not properly taken, for he exhorts to be minded as he was: *Following after the Resurrection of the Dead.* Verse 11. That is, that state of holiness, which the Saints shall be invested with at the resurrection (call'd the resurrection of the dead

metony

metonymically) which will be in a proper sence perfect; and in a word, to press after perfection, from a lively sence of their own imperfection.

2. From the Exhortations, to press after perfection, *Math.* 5. 48. *Be ye therefore perfect.*

Answ. Such commands are the measure of our duty, not of our attainments: *I* mean in this life. In the life to come indeed we shall be like God, in this life we are Children that bear small resemblance to their Parent. See 1 *Joh.* 3. 2. That which is now our rule, shall be then our reward.

3. 1 *Joh.* 3. 9. Whosoever is born of God, does not commit sin.

Answ. 1. We may interpret it, that as he is born of God, he does not sin. Every Childe of God is *mixta persona* (as our Law says of the King in another sence) consists of an old and new nature; and so his new nature is the *principium quo*, the Principle from which he acts graciously; and the old nature, the principle from which he acts sinfully. As mortal or immortal, lyable or not lyable to Death, is truly affirmed of the same Man, in respect of the divers parts of his nature, Body and Soul.

2. It may intend the manner of sinning, So the 8. *Verse* seems to limit it. *He that committeth sin is of the Devil, for the Devil sinneth from the beginning.* The comparison is not between the act simply, for then it should have been said only, *for the Devil sinneth*; *but from the beginning*, implies a comparison between the manner of Mans sins,

 and

and the Devils, in respect of which he is said to be of the Devil, because he imitates his example, who from the Day he began, never ceased to sin, nor ever did one truly good action.

Errour 6.

That Christ enlightens every Man to Salvation.
George Whitehead's *Voice of Wisdom.*

WHere note, that the word *Christ* is a meer blinde, to delude the ignorant; for the *Quakers* denying Christ to be God, they cannot own him for the Author of illumination. The Scripcures I urge against this Tenent, are *Eph.* 2. 12. *That at that time ye were without Christ, having no hope, &c.* That last clause I intend especially, which must needs be understood either of the act of hope, or of the ground or warrant of hope; not of the former, for *having no hope* is a badge of distinction between *Jew* and *Gentile*, as appears by the connexion with the foregoing clause, *Aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel*, (that Common-wealth and Church being commensurate;) but if we understand it of the act of hope, the want of that did not distinguish the *Gentile* from the *Jewes*; for many of the *Jewes* laboured under the same want. Many of them were unbelievers, and so had no hope. (One difference between faith and hope being this

this, that the former looks at the promise of the benefit; the latter at the benefit in the promise.) *Fides respicit verbum rei, spes rem verbi. Luther.* We must understand the phrase then of having no ground or warrant of hope, and to that interpretation the foregoing clause leads us, *Strangers from the Covenants of promises.* And *Gentiles* thereby were distinguished from the *Jews*, whose the promises are said to be. *Rom. 9. 4. viz.* the promises of Christ and Salvation. From the words thus explained I argue:

Arg. They that had no promises of Christ, and Salvation by him, could know of none. But the *Gentiles* for a time had none, therefore they knew of none, and consequently had not a light or knowledge sufficient to bring them to Salvation.

The major is evident, every act supposes an object. I cannot know that which is not. The minor is proved by 1 *Tim. 3. last.* where, *God manifest in the Flesh*, and as such *preached to the Gentiles*, are made two parts of the mystery of godliness: and by that pregnant place, the mystery of Christ, which in other Ages was not made known unto the Sons of Men, as it is now revealed to his holy Apostles, and Prophets, by the Spirit, that the *Gentiles* should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel, *Eph 3. 4, 5, 6.* The place may be its own Comment, it is so plain.

2. *Luk.* 10. 21. Thou hast hid these things

 from

from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes The Father is said to hide the Object, because he did not inlighten the Subject, *i. e.* To hide the Gospel, which was then openly and plainly preached, because he did not inlighten their mindes with a saving knowledge of it.

3. 1 Cor. 2. 14. *The natural Man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*

1. Observe, here is an opposition between men and men, in respect of the knowledge of the things of God. The spiritual man judges all spiritual things, *vers.* 15. but the natural man knows not, nor judges them. Yea, he accounts the Doctrine of the Gospel foolishness.

2. The natural man not only does not know them, but cannot, because they are spiritually discerned, which imports a disproportion between the object and faculty; (such for instance) as between sence, and a rational object.

Whence the Apostle speaks of an understanding given to know Christ, 1 *John* 5. 20. implying, that our old understanding will not serve to apprehend Christ after a spiritual, though it may, to apprehend him after a rational manner.

The Scriptures which carry any colour for the Quakers *Opinion, of all that I have met with, are these.*

1 Joh. 1. 9. *That was the true Light, which light-*

lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.

Anſ. Chriſt being ſpoken of before, as the Meſſias, or Saviour, to whom *John* did bear witneſs, *verſ.* 7. we muſt therefore underſtand the place, *I* think not of natural Light, but ſupernatural; not of the Light of Reaſon, wherewith as God, he indues men; but of the Light of the Goſpel, with which, as the Meſſias, he inlightens Men: which light may admit of a double conſideration, according to the uſe of the word φωτίζω, which ſignifies, 1. To ſhine, or to light; that is, afford light, by which the object is made viſible, whether there be an Eye to ſee it, or no; ſo 'tis uſed, *Luke* 11. 36. 1 *Cor.* 4. 5. 2. 'Tis uſed to inlighten the eye or faculty, *Eph.* 1. 18. *That the eyes of your underſtanding may be inlightned, &c.* If you take it in the former ſence, Chriſt by his powerfull preaching, and glorious miracles, did not ſhine on every man. Many never heard his Doctrine, nor ſaw his Works. As ſome parts of the World ſee not the Sun, when it ſhines brightly in our Horizon. So that the meaning can be no more than this, that the Goſpel is taught to all comers without exception, by Chriſt and his Miniſters; not that every particular perſon hath the benefit: Many in all ages never heard, (no nor perhaps heard of) the Goſpel. 2. If we take the word in the other ſence, for inlightning the Eyes of the mind, 'tis certain, that many who are lighted (as our phraſe is, when a Candle is carried before us) are not inlightned, but are

like a blind man so lighted, that sees never the better. And then the meaning can be no more than this, that whosoever are inlightned, are inlightned by him, and answers in sence to *Jam.* 1. 17. *Every good gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights.* And lest we may seem to impose upon the Objector, we will turn to a parallel place, *Psal.* 145. 14. *The Lord upholdeth all that fall, and raiseth up all them that be bowed down.* 'Tis evident enough, that however the words sound, the sence can be but this, that all that are upheld from falling, or raised again after a fall, are in God's debt for the help of his hand.

2*ly*. *Rom.* 2. 15. The *Gentiles* are said to have the Law in their Hearts. *Whitehead, Voyce of Wisdom.*

Answ. They are also said to be without Law, and are imposed to them that had the Law, *vers.* 12. *viz.* of *Moses*, *vers.*17. *Called the Oracles of God*, Chap. 3. 2. and made the Priviledges of the *Jewes* above the *Gentiles*, *vers.* 1. in this respect, because hereby *Salvation was of the Jewes. John* 4. 22. *i.e.* the knowledge of the way of *Salvation*: therefore it cannot be understood of a *saving Knowledge* without a Contradiction.

2. It is not the Law in their hearts, but the Work of the Law, *viz.* these two effects mentioned, *accusing* and *excusing*. For though tis true, the Gentiles having some knowledge of the Law, the Law may be said to be in their

hearts

hearts, meaning their understandings; yet in the Apostles use of that Phrase, *Heb.* 8. 12. he seems to include, if not mainly intend a suitable disposition to the Law, or a *delight in the Law after the inner man*, Rom. 7. 22. Whereas the Gentiles in this sence, had not the Law in their hearts; For they liked not to retain God in their knowledge, *Rom.* 1. 26. but as he was an unbidden, so an unwelcome Guest to them; so that they could scarce forbear to say to God, *Depart from us, for we desire not the Knowledge of thy Wayes*, Job 21. 14.

3*ly*. Rom. 1. 19. *That which may be known of God is manifested in them, for God hath shewed it unto them*. [*viz.* the Gentiles.]

Answ. The next Verse suggests an answer, *viz.* that which might be known of God by arguing from the Effects to the Cause, from the Creation to the being of God, and his Eternal Power, the first Divine property that appeared in giving Being to all things out of nothing; and the uniform event of this knowledge, is said to be the leaving them without excuse, not the leading them to Salvation.

4*ly*. Isa. 49. 6. *I have set thee for a Light to the Gentiles*, &c. Spoken of Christ.

Answ. That is but a Prophecy of the Gentiles mercy, in the times of Christs actual Exhibition in the flesh, which was not fulfilled till the Jewes rejection of Christ, as appears by *Act.* 13. 46, 47. And the same Apostle, *Rom.* 11. *The*

 casting,

casting away of them [the Jewes] *was the reconciling of the World* (viz.) *the Gentiles*, vers. 15.

Errour 7.

The Scriptures are not the Word of God, but only a true Declaration of it; nor are they the only Rule of Faith and Life. G. Whitehead *Voyce of Wisdom*, p. 20. Sam. Fisher, *Quaker Folly*, p. 28.

TO bring any testimony of Scripture, concerning it self, were *Petitio principii*, *a begging of the Question*, and were insignificant for their conviction, who deny it's Divine Authority. And to urge Arguments drawn from *the purity of Scriptures Precepts*; *Sureness of Principles of Trust*; *Excellency of Rewards*; *Sublimity of Doctrine*; *Prediction of future Contingents*; *the Secresy and Efficacy of it's Operation on the hearts of men*, (being such as no other Writing can give us a single instance of the like;) *the Miracles* (whereof, multitudes of Adversaries were eye-Witnesses, able and willing to discover the Impostures (if any had been) *Wrought for the Confirmation of it*: I say, to urge these Arguments, were to launch into an Ocean of Discourse: I shall therefore only give a taste of their Arguments,

ments, and so leave their Tenent to the Judgment of the Understanding.

The *Quakers* Arguments will discover their meaning, without any Explication of the terms.

Arg. Your Scripture is without: but the Word of God is within, *Rom.* 10. 8. *The word nigh thee, even in thy heart*, Fisher, p. 31.

Answ. 1. Our Scripture is *within* as well as *without*. That Command, *Let the Word of God dwell within you*, Col. 3. 16. is in a degree, obeyed by every Saint. And therefore by this Argument, *Scripture* is *the Word of God*.

2. That very Scripture, *Rom.* 10. 8. speaks not of the *Light within*, but of *the Scriptures*; for the Apostle calls it *the Word of Faith which he preached*, *latter Clause of the Verse*, which he tells us was the Doctrine contained in the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, *Acts* 26. 22. [where we may observe, that the *Quakers* urge the Scriptures for their Tenents against us, only as *Argumentum ad hominem*, to confute us by our own Principles, not that they own the Authority of Scripture.]

Arg. 2. *If there was a rule before the Scripture was written, then that is not our rule. But there was a rule before the Scripture.* Fishers, Quakers Folly, &c. p. 29. *Whitehead*, by way of Question to the same effect, *what was their rule who spake forth the Scriptures?* Voyce of Wisdom. *Quest.* 4.

Answ.

Answ. The matter contained now in the Scripture, was always the Rule, before it was committed to Writing, though it was not always in the same manner, nor degree, conveyed, and published. Since the Gospel preached to *Adam*, *Gen.* 3. 15. there hath not been any *addition*, *quoad Essentiam*, but only *quoad Explicationem*; not in substance, but in cleerness of Discovery. In that respect, God is said to have spoken to the Fathers by the Prophets *at sundry times*, or (as the *Greek* Reads) *by many parts*, or *peece-meal*, πολυμερῶς. *Heb.* 1. 1. And the way of conveyance hath been different, *in diverse manners*, πολυτρόπως. *In the same Verse*, (viz.) Visions, Dreams, &c. In opposition to both which, God is said to have spoken to us by his Son in his Person, and Apostles, who have left us a clear Comment on the old Testament. And we are not now to expect any new Discovery of Truth, *Ex parte rei revelatæ vel Objecti*, as to the matter revealed; but only, *Ex parte actus revelandi, vel subjecti*, as to the Persons whom God Inlightens gradually, to discern the evidence of what is revealed in Scripture.

Arg. 3. *What was the Gentiles Rule, who had not the Scripture?*

Answ. 1. So much of the matter contained in the Scriptures, as is written on their Hearts. For the Scriptures gives us a Copy of all that is Written there, with many Additions; a new Object of Faith, God in Christ, Old Duties insorced by New Arguments, Love to one another,

ther, prefled by the example of Christs redeeming Love, *John* 3. 34. Sins against Light of Nature (as Uncleanness) dissuaded from, by Arguments drawn from Union between Christ, and our Bodies; Christs property in them by Redemption, *&c.* 1 *Cor.* 6. 14. to the end.

2. When we affirm the Scriptures to be the only *rule*, we must in reason be supposed to intend, to them who have them, not who have them not.

3. We must understand this Point in Conjunction with the former, *the Light within* : and so we say, that they who have not the Scripture, since it's Publication, have not any other way, a Discovery of God sufficient to lead them to him, and so to Salvation; which we intend, when we affirm the Scripture to be the Word of God.

Arg. 4. *What is their Rule who cannot Read the Scriptures? Must they be Condemned, who cannot Read them?*

Answ. 1. The same Rule with their's who can, (*viz.*) the Matter contained in the Scriptures, however conveyed, whither by Eye or Ear.

2. They shall not be condemned for their natural Incapacity (unless accidentally, as their neglect of Learning to Read, that they might be able to Read the Scriptures, is their Sin) but for their Unbelief and Disobedience to the Doctrine of the Scripture, by what means soever come to their Knowledge.

As

As for that Notion of the *Quakers*, in the Terms of the Question, that the Scripture is but a true Declaration of the Word of God [in the Hearts of Believers, as *Whitehead* explains, *p.16.*] *I* say but this:

Answ. 1. The Scripture is a Declaration of what ought to be in the Hearts of Believers, and not only of what is. 2. The Pen-men understood not all they wrote, 1 *Pet.* 1.10,12. And there are *Prophecies* and Histories of things done before the Pen-mens Birth, as well as personal Experiences.

Errour 8.

That there is no need of any outward Teaching; Cease from your out-side lights, and return to the Light of Christ in you, and this Light is not a Chapter without you in a Book. James Naylor, in his Glory of the Lord shining out of the North. *p.2.*

THe only Argument *I* shall urge, is from *Eph.* 4. 11, 12, 13. *He* [*Christ*] *gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, for the perfecting of the Saints.* Whence I draw this Argument, If Christ hath setled Officers in his Church, till it be made perfect in grace, then there is need of outward teaching, during its whole state in this life. But he hath made such settle-

ettlement, &c. The Antecedent is evident in the Text before us. The consequence goes upon suppositon of what I have before proved. (viz.) that no members of the Church arrive to a perfection of grace in this life, and therefore cannot be said at any time not to stand in need of teaching.

The Scriptures which the Quakers *urge against the need of outward Teaching, are these:*

Their first Scripture,

Heb. 8. 11. *And they shall not teach every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his brother, saying, know the Lord.*

Answ. That place cannot exclude outward teaching, unless it could be no means of knowledge; or unless there could be no knowledge of God, but what were of immediate revelation to the subject in which it is found. For, compare this place taken out of *Jer.* 31. 34. with *Isa.* 2. 3. (speaking of the times of the Gospel, in which the promise before us, was to receive its full accomplishment) and we finde, that *Out of Zion was to go forth the* Law, *and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem. i. e.* The knowledge of God to be conveyed by Ordinances, for which, Zion the Hill whereon, *Jerusalem* the City wherein, the Temple the Seat of Ordinances stood [See *Psal.* 87. 2, 3. & *Psal.* 122.] are often put. And the

the fulfilling of it, Christ and his Apostles di frequently teach in Zion, or the Temple, and s in *Jerusalem*, Math. 26. 55. And the great Commission Apostolical was, *To preach among all Nations, beginning at Jerusalem*, Luke 24.47. It doe not then exclude the teachings of men. But i we compare this part of the Verse with the la Clause, *For all shall know me from the least to th greatest*; the meaning is evident, (*viz.*) that *Go* does not hereby exclude, but include the teach ings of Men, and promise a greater efficacy t them than formerly; so that the Christians o the New Testament should be able *to leave th Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, and to go on t perfection.* (As the Apostle speaks, *Heb.* 6. 1. *i. e.* not to forget, or unlearn them, but not t stick in them, without further progress; (as so a Scholar to be always learning Grammar, an never proceed to Rhetorick, Logick, &c.

Second Scripture is, 1 Joh. 2. 27. *Ye need no that any Man teach you.*

Answ. This is spoken in opposition to any o *the seducers, vers.* 26. whose teaching the Chri stians needed not. In which sence the *Colossian* are said to be *compleat in Christ, Col.* 2. 10, 8. i opposition to *Mosaical* Ceremonies, humane tra ditions, or Phylosophical Principles, which migh pretend to discover somewhat necessary to salva tion, not revealed in the Gospel, or contrary to that revelation: which interpretation of the tex before us, is favoured by the latter clause; *but a*

the same anointing teacheth you all things, and is truth, and is no lie. 1 *Joh.* 2. 27.

2. This place will bear another interpretation, (*viz.*) that they were grown Christians, such as did not altogether depend upon others, but knew somewhat themselves; (having an inward light, or spiritual judgment (called) (metonymically *an anointment.*) That Character, *ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the Truth,* 2 *Tim.* 3. 7. However it agreed to other Christians, did not agree to them: so that in the *Quakers* interpretation, there is the fallacy; *a dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter* (as Logicians speak;) that is, to take those words absolutely, which are intended in a certain respect. And that theirs cannot be the meaning, will appear to any one, that shall but remember, that after Christs ascention, when the spirit was poured out in most plentiful measure; (so that if at any time on Earth, then might the teachings of Man seem needless) there was greatest plenty of Teachers extraordinary, ordinary, (as we finde in the Acts of the Apostles.)

Another Branch of the *Quakers* Errour, as to Ordinances, refers to *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, of which they affirm, that *they cease upon the appearance of Christ within.* A. P's. *several Papers*, p. 19. *Farnworth's Discovery of Faith.* p. 11.

Against

Against which Errour, I oppose two Arguments; one for both Ordinances, the other for Baptism in particular.

Arg. 1. If Baptism and the Lord's Supper are standing Ordinances, [or such as we are obliged to use, during this life] then they do not cease upon the appearance of Christ within, [or are not made useless or unnecessary by any degree of attainments in this life.] But the former is true, therefore the latter.

That they are standing Ordinances, appears, because no formal repeal can be produced, either *in terminis*, or by any due consequence from Scripture; nor yet any virtual repeal, as in Laws made for a time, and at the expiration thereof, of course, ceasing to oblige.

That then they do not cease as to our need of them, follows evidently, because it is not to be supposed consistent with Christ's wisdome, to continue an obligation upon us, to the use of a means, when the end is obtained already.

All that can be said with any colour, is, that they are of perpetual obligation, *till the appearance of Christ within*; that is, a full appearance, or state of perfection. But we having proved before, that there is no such state attainable in this life; then if those Ordinances oblige, till we be arrived at perfection, they oblige, and so are of use, during term of life.

Arg. 2 If Baptism be a Foundation-Doctrine, (as I may call it) then it is of use during this life.

That

That it is such, appears by *Heb. 6. 1, 2.* where the Apostle calls *the Doctrine of Baptism a Foundation*; by which phrase of the Apostle, the knowledge of the use and intendment of that Ordinance by those, who had or were to receive it, seems to be meant. The consequence is good, If it be an Ordinance, all Christians are to understand and improve, then they must receive it. Being baptized into Christs dear ,cannot be an argument to induce the unbaptized to a mortification of sin, which the Apostle urges upon the baptized, *Rom. 6. 3, 4.*

If it be said, that the Apostle exhorts the *Hebrews to leave this Principle or Foundation of Christian Doctrine, vers. 1.* I answer, that by leaving it, the Apostle cannot mean relinquishing the practice thereof. For then by force of the same phrase, applyed to Faith and Repentance, *&c.* These graces must also be left, (the contrary whereto I have before proved) but the Apostle explains himself, that they should not so stick in the foundation, as not to proceed to the superstructure, or highest points of Christian doctrine. I could never meet with any thing, that looked like an Argument, for their opinion, but that place, which speaks of *shewing forth the Lord's Death*, in the Supper, *till he come*, which they interpret, *till he come in the spirit.* 1 Cor. 11. 26.

Answ. So Christ was come already to the believing *Corinthians.* The Apostle speaking of them and himself, says, *We have received not the*

Spirit of the World, but the Spirit which is of God, 1 Ep. *chap.* 2. *v.* 12. And yet that hindred not the Apostles incouragement and direction in their use of the Lords Supper, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26, 28.

Errour 9.

That there is no Resurrection from the Dead. Rob. Turner *in a Letter of his to the* Baptists, *and* George Whitehead, *in his late* Answer *to* W. Burnet, *and* George Fox, Jun. *in his Works bound up together.*

THe Scripture is plentiful in asserting the Resurrection. *I* shall only single out one Argument to evince it.

Arg. If the bodies that have done Good or Evil, must receive their reward accordingly, then the same bodies that dye must rise again. But the Antecedent is true, therefore also the Consequent.

That the bodies that have done Good or Evil, must receive their reward accordingly (which Proposition is the ancecedent) is evident by 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. And then the Consequence is firm, because those bodies receive not their Reward, till the universal Judgment, and then they cannot receive it (having been once dissolved) unless they rise again.

For

For the further proof of antecedent and consequent, I shall first explain the Terms of Christ's Argument to prove the *Resurrection* from the Dead, which to ordinary Readers may seem inconsequent, and then shew how the Argument is induced.

The place is *Mat.* 22. 31, 32. As *touching their Resurrection from the Dead, have ye not Read that which was spoken unto you by God, Saying, I am the God of* Abraham, *and the God of* Isaac, *and the God of* Jacob: *God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living.* And tis added, *Luke* 20. 38. *For all live unto him.*

To be a God to Abraham, notes, a Covenant-Relation, and so an Obligation to confer all the Blessings of the Covenant; among which, Eternal Glory is, though the last, yet not the least, *Not the God of the Dead*, that might be meent either of them who are dead, *simply*, or of them that are so dead, as that they shall never return to life: Not in the former sence, for God proclaimed himself the God of *Abraham*, &c. long after he was dead; therefore in the latter sence: *But of the living*, that is of them whom God intends to restore to Life, or whose bodies live *Potentially*, not only of them, whose Souls live *Actually*: *For all live to him*, that Clause seems to import a reason of that Denomination *living*, given to those that were truly *dead*, viz. *That God calls the things that are not as if they were*, Rom. 4. 19. Because of his Omnipotency, and

Immutability of his Counsel.

Concerning the Scope of these Words, there are different apprehensions, some conceive that Christ hereby proves the Immortality of the Soul (which the *Sadducees* denied, as appears by *Acts* 23.8. For if there be no Soul of a Spiritual Nature in man, it must needs be Mortal, as his body) and by consequence only, the Resurrection of the body.

The *Sadducees* denying the Resurrection of the body, because they denyed the Immortality of the Soul, (as these *Interpreters* conceive) others, that Christ intends only to prove the Resurrection of the body, so *Calvin.* Others that Christ intends both directly, so *Beza, Diodati.* And hence the Argument of our Lord is somewhat differently framed. Either thus;

They whose God, God is, shall rise from the Dead. God is Abraham's, Isaac's, *and* Jacob's *God.*

Therefore they (and upon the same ground all other Believers) shall rise again. The consequence he proves, because God is the God only of the Living, and so seeing they live in Soul, they shall live in Body too. Or else thus

They whose God, God is after death, shall rise again. But God is the God of *Abraham*, &c. (and consequently of all Believers) after death; therefore *Abraham*, &c. shall rise again.

The reason of the consequence is, because otherwise God were not the God of *Abraham's, Isaac's*, and *Jacob's* (and so other Believers) persons

ersons, but of their Souls only; whereas to be the God of their Persons, is to be under a Covenant to give them (as other things, so) Glory; and so their bodies must be glorified, as well as their Souls (their Persons being constituted or made up of those two Essential parts:) or the Argument may be framed more plainly thus, in the sence of Christs Words:

If God be under a Promise to glorifie the Persons of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, then their bodies must rise again; But God is under such a Promise, therefore, their bodies must rise again.

The antecedent is evident by the Explication of the Terms above. The consequence depends upon a double ground, partly Gods Fidelity in making good his Promise, and partly because *Abrahams*, &c. body is uncapable of the benefit of the Promise of Glory, made to it, without a Resurrection. And the Argument thus phrased, suggests a fuller answer to the Exception made against it, as first laid down. (*viz.*) *That God might be the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob after death, if there were no Resurrection; because their Souls live, in respect of which, God were their God.*

Answ. First, God is said to be *the God of Abraham*, that is, of his Person, for his Soul is but part of his Person, not the whole; and to be the God of the Person includes the glorifying of the whole Person, not only of a part.

2. God were not fully *Abraham*'s God, or did not fully make good his Promise, if he glorified one part of *Abraham* and not another.

3. Nor were the Promise to glorifie *Abraham*'s Soul, made good, without glorifying his body too: for the Happiness of the Soul is not perfect without the body, it's dear and beloved Companion; (the Soul having a strong desire and Inclination to a re-union to the body (as the Schools not without good ground determine) *Vid Calvin. Harm. Evang.* in Mat. 22. 31, 32. Luc.20 38.

4. *If* whole *Abraham* be not the correlate in the Covenant, or party Covenanted with, how is any thing (as in the Text a Resurrection) attributed to him, in respect of a part of him? There cannot be a ground for a Limitation in respect of a part, (as here; that *Abraham* should rise as to his body,) unless the Whole be in Being [either Actually as to his Soul, or Potentially as to his Body, in respect of the Decree and Covenant of God] *Vid. Vedel. Rationale Theologicum*, l. 2. c. 6.

To apply the sum of Christs Argument, for the proof of the antecedent, and consequent of my Argument for the Resurrection, which was this:

If the bodies that have done Good or Evil must receive their Reward accordingly, then the same bodies must rise again, *&c.*

That

That the bodies that have done good must receive their reward, is evident, because God is under a *promise* to reward them. And rise again they must, because else God's Promise to the bodies must either not be made good at all, or not to the same body to which it was made (which is contrary to the whole Scope of Christ's Argument.)

If any shall say that Christ's Argument and my Application of it, proves but the Resurrection of the good, and their Reward in their bodies. I answer two things;

1. That the *Sadducees* and *Quakers* Proposition being, *That there is no Resurrection from the dead*, which is an universal Negative, therefore a particular Affirmative, that *some* [the good] *shall rise again*, is contradictory thereto, and overthrows their Negative; and therefore to prove that all shall rise again, is not strictly needful: for that were *Oppositio contraria*, not *Contradictoria* (as the *Logicians* speak.) Yet *Ex abundanti*, I answer,

2. Christs Argument suggests another to us, for the proof of the Resurrection of the bad. For by the same Reason, that the good must rise, because of God's Promise to Glorifie their Bodies; the wicked also must rise, because of God's threatning to torment their Bodies. For God is not more bound to fulfill his Promises, than his threats, when they have some stamp or character upon them; (as an Oath for instance,

Heb. 3. 18. *Chap.* 7. 21.) whereby they may be known to be *signa beneplaciti*, discoveries of God's secret will or decree. Which limitation I add, because 'tis evident, that some promises and threats have a tacite condition, upon which, though not the act of Divine will, yet the things willed depend, as 1 *Sam.* 2. 30 *Jonah* 3. 4, 10. and in the non-performance of them God does not cross, but comply with his secret will.

Turner's Argument against the Resurrection, are:

Arg. From *Eccles.* 3. 19, 20, 21. Whence he concludes, the fleshly Bodies of Men rise not again, for if the fleshly Bodies of Men rise again, and not the flesh of Beasts; then Mens Bodies have a preheminence over a Beasts Body: and to affirm the Bodies of Men shall rise again, were to give *Solomon* the lie.

Answ. Men are said to be Beasts κατὰ τὶ not simply, but in a certain respect, (*viz.*) in respect of the mortality of the Body, which being composed of the same materials with brute Beasts, is as lyable to a dissolution. In respect of the immortality of Mans Soul, and the Resurrection of his Body, *He hath preheminence above a Beast.* As for *Verse* 21. if they be the Atheists words, personated by *Solomon*, they note the Reason of his Opinion, because the difference between Man and Beast, as to their future state, is not visible, as their agreement in their dissolution is. If they be *Solomon's* own words, he can-

not

not be supposed to mean any more, than that the different disposal of the spirits of Man and Beast, is not visible to the eye of sence, and but dimly to the eye of reason and faith; and so may be an occasion of the Atheists conceit, that that difference in their future state, is but talk, and uncertain conjecture. For *Ch.* 12. 7. *Solomon* tells us, that *The Spirit of Man returns to God that gave it*, [*viz.* to be disposed of, as Justice, or Mercy shall see meet.]

Arg. 2. From *Job* 7. 8. *The Eye of him that hath seen me, shall see me no more.* But if all rise again, then the Eye that hath seen him, may see him again; which Opinion giveth *Job* the lie.

Answ. The meaning of *Job* can be, but that the Eye that had seen him, should after his death see him no more *in statu quo*, not with such worldly comforts about him, as now he had; *Verse* 10. he instances, in *a return to his House*. They that had seen him an Inhabitant in the Land of *Uz*, should never see him there again in that capacity. *Vers.* 7. *He says his Eye should see no more good*; compare that passage with this in hand, and they amount to this, that *Job* should after death no more injoy the accommodations of this life, and therefore no Eye could be witness of any such injoyment. That *Job* did not intend a denial of the Resurrection of his Body, unless we will make *Job* give himself the lie, is evident by *Chap.* 19. 26, 27. *And though after my Skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my Flesh shall I see God;*

whom

whom I shall see for my self, and mine Eyes shall behold, and not another, though my Reins be consumed within me. Of which place, he that would see a full explication, let him read the *Learned Caryl Comm. on Job.* All that I shall infer from the summe of the words, discernable by an ordinary judgment, is, that if *Job* had the same body after the Resurrection, that he had before, then he was as visible after, as before it.

Arg. 3. From 1 *Cor.* 15. 50. *Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*; then not the body of Man (says the *Quaker*) for that is flesh, and in it is blood.

Answ. The latter Clause of this Verse explains the former, *Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption*; where the Apostle gives us to understand, that a corruptible Body shall not inherit a state of immortality [the adjunct being put for the subject, in both words:] And the *Quakers* interpretation crosses the whole drift of the Apostle in a great part of the Chapter, which is to shew that the same Body shall rise, but with so different qualities, that it shall be as unlike to what it was before, as the standing Corn, to the Seed put into the Earth; or as one Star is to another in brightness and lustre, *Vers.* 37, 38, 41. And the Apostle enumerates those qualities, *Vers.* 42, 43, 44. The sum whereof is, that that body which was before *mortal, i. e.* liable to death, *natural, i. e.* supported by food, rest, *&c. dishonoured* by being used as an Instrument of sin; and by weaknesses,

neſſes, blemiſhes, the fruits of ſin, ſhall become *immortal*, *i. e.* not liable to death; *ſpiritual*, *i. e.* not needing nor uſing its former props; *glorious*, neither ſubject to ſin or the puniſhment of it.

I might have been much larger on theſe points; but *I* know great Books finde few buyers, and fewer *Readers*, and therefore I reſolved not to exceed *Six* Sheets. I wiſh what I have done, may prove profitable. *If* my Anſwers ſeem not ſo cleer as the Objections (which I hope I need not fear, unleſs in the point of the *Trinity*, that being a myſtery ſo high, that it rebates the ſharpeſt edge of humane underſtanding) I deſire the *Reader* to ponder upon this grave ſaying of a learned Man: *It is eaſier to oppoſe, than to defend the Chriſtian Religion; for it having ſomething in it above the capacity of Man's underſtanding, 'tis no hard matter by reaſon to oppoſe ſuch a Religion.* Villeroy, *in his Counceller of State.*

FINIS.

AN

ADVERTISEMENT.

ONe *of* W. Pens *Arguments against the Trinity, I had almost omitted (it being out of its proper Place, in his Book,* viz. *that in* p.10. *) If the God-head subsist in Three distinct Manners or Forms, then one of them cannot be a compleat Subsistence without the other two, and so parts, and something finite would be in God; or if infinite, then Three distinct infinite Subsistences, and by consequence Three distinct Gods.*

Answ. *Not to Quarrel at the Impropriety of* Pens *Phrase, nor at the Coincidence, in effect of this with his Third Arguments. I answer, by denying the consequence, For as every Person is compleat,* In esse quid ditativo, per Essentiam; i. e. *is truly God by having the Divine Nature: So is every Person compleat*

In

in esse Personali per Subsistentiam, (as the Schools speak;) i.e. *is a compleat Subsistent or Person, by his proper manner of Subsisting. And I wonder he should not see, that his Argument may be retorted upon him thus. If the God-head be in Three Manners or Forms, then the God-head in one manner, must needs be a compleat Subsistent, and distinct from the God-head in the other two manners: Or more plainly thus; If the same God-head be in Father, Son, and Spirit, then they must needs be distinct one from another, and any one compleat without the other two. God the Father cannot be God the Son, nor can God the Son be God the Father: Though both Father and Son are one God. For the Persons are formally Constituted by their relative Properties, and so the God-head considered with its Three relative Properties, admits of a Three-fold distinction from it self absolutely considered.*

If any shall wonder at the Distance of Time, between the Date of the Epistle and

Pub-

Publication, he may please to know, that the Whole Book (except the Advertisement) was finished before the Epistle; but by reason of some intervening Accidents (not needful, nor altogether Convenient to be mentioned) could not get through the Press till now.

ERRATA.

Title page, dele Collected. Ep. to *Reader*, p. 1. l. 15. for referd *r.* refin'd, *l.* 19. for charitably devout, *r.* charitable and devout, p.4. *l.* 4. for and like this, *r.* as in this instance. Book. p. 8. *l.* 3. dele or, *p.* 14. *l.* 4. dele the properties of, and after attributes, *r.* among themselves, and with their Subjects, *p.* 17. *l.* 7. for of Persons in the nature Three, *r.* Three Persons in the nature, *p.* 24. *l.* 1. far counterpriæ *r.* counterprice. *p.* 35. *l.* 8. dele had. The Literal Faults may easily be seen, and amended.

at
se-
ut
ts
nt
gh

15.
ri-
a-
ro-
nd
re
un-
ral